

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
FINAL Minutes July 23, 2019**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Julian Bivins, Vice-Chair; Daphne Spain; Jennie More; Pam Riley; Bruce Dotson; Karen Firehock; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Other officials present were David Benish, Interim Director of Planning; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; Greg Kamptner; Megan Nedostup; Stacey Pethia; and Andy Herrick.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

Mr. Keller called the regular meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

**From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda**

Mr. Keller noted that there was a translator present in the audience, who could come forward to the microphone as needed.

A representative from Habitat for Humanity addressed the public and said that if Spanish translation was desired, to take a headset and translation would be provided. She then addressed the public in Spanish.

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. Hearing none, he then noted that it had been advertised that the public hearing on Southwood would be addressed first, and then a regular item dealing with housing policy. Mr. Keller said that in the final agenda, these items will be reversed.

Mr. Keller asked for a motion that the Southwood item be addressed first.

Mr. Bivins moved that the Southwood item occur first, in light of the number of people in attendance interested in Southwood, and to make the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan regarding housing the second item, as originally advertised.

Ms. More seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7:0.

**Consent Agenda**

**Approval of Minutes:** June 18, 2019; June 25, 2019

Mr. Keller asked if any commissioner wished to pull an item from the consent agenda for discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Ms. Spain moved to approve the consent agenda. Ms. More seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7:0.

## Public Hearing Items

### ZMA201800003 Southwood Phase 1

Mr. Keller said that in the staff report, there were potentially two items for the Commission to vote on. He said that there would actually only be one item to vote on, which would be clarified by staff. He then asked for the staff report.

Ms. Megan Nedostup, principal planner presenting the Southwood rezoning, said that she knew there would be a good amount of discussion and comments. She said that the staff report contained an extensive, detailed analysis and that since the project has been discussed in previous work sessions, she would quickly provide an overview of the property's location, highlight the proposal and items that have been revised since the work session that took place on June 4, and provide staff factors (favorable and unfavorable) in order to provide ample time for questions.

Ms. Nedostup said that the county attorney, Mr. Greg Kamptner, was also present to provide an overview of the performance agreement. She said that the housing planner, Ms. Stacey Pethia, along with transportation planner Mr. Kevin McDermott, and Adam Moore with VDOT, to answer questions as well.

Ms. Nedostup said that the Southwood mobile home park was located along Old Lynchburg Road. She indicated to two maps – one an aerial photograph, and the other highlighting the parcels along with environmental features. Ms. Nedostup indicated to Old Lynchburg Road on the aerial photo, as well as to three parcels. She said that Biscuit Run Park is to the south and indicated to the Whittington subdivision located in the southwest, and to the Mosby Mountain subdivision which is directly across the street to the west. Ms. Nedostup said that the county office building was off the map and indicated northwards to where it would be located and said that Covenant School is located to the north as well.

Ms. Nedostup said that the properties are mainly wooded and contain a number of environmental features, including streams. She indicated on the second map to Old Lynchburg Road and noted the stream buffer and flood plain, as well as managed and preserved steep slopes. Ms. Nedostup said that within the existing parcel are 341 existing mobile homes on what will be Phase II and indicated to this area on the map. She noted, however, that this area is not requested for rezoning at present time.

Ms. Nedostup said that the proposal is to rezone 33.96 acres from R-2 Residential and Neighborhood Model District (NMD) to all NMD. She said that 450 maximum residential units and 50,000 square feet of nonresidential is proposed. Ms. Nedostup said that open space that contains trails, steep slopes, stream buffer, and flood plain are within Blocks 1 and 2. She indicated to a hatched area along an edge of the map, which is Block 1 and contains the steep slopes, flood plain, and stream buffers, as well as a trail to be located in this area. Ms. Nedostup said that there are trail buffers that go along the edge of the property line and along Old Lynchburg Road. She said that there are recreational areas (both active and passive) and neighborhood parks that are distributed across the rest of the blocks.

Ms. Nedostup said that the Comprehensive Plan designates these parcels as Urban Density Residential, which is 6-34 units per acre, with a center designation at Hickory Street and Old

Lynchburg Road. She said that the Master Plan states that the redevelopment of Southwood Mobile Home Park should be as a mixed-income, mixed-use community, and that a mixture of housing types for different income levels is expected. Ms. Nedostup said that a retail and/or services area should be provided for the neighborhood.

Ms. Nedostup said that since the work session, the code of development and application plan was updated and reformatted. She presented a slide that shows that each character area is now its own block and indicated to a neighborhood center special area overlay that was added along Hickory Street within Blocks 11 and 12.

Ms. Nedostup said that future phases of the development plan were added on page 5 and indicates in the code of development how the rest of Southwood might be developed if using the same block types and intensity. She said that the greenspaces and amenities, including descriptions, are provided in the code of development on pages 15 and 16, and in total meet the requirements of the ordinance for size.

Ms. Nedostup said that in addition to the changes within the code, the building height for blocks adjacent to Hickory Street was reduced from 65 feet to four stories (or 45 feet), and within the neighborhood center special overlay it was reduced to four stories (or 50 feet). She said that the building regulations table on page 13 has been updated to include Old Lynchburg Road, noting there was a question in the work session about whether the framework street and building regulations would apply to Old Lynchburg Road, and that they have been revised to apply. Ms. Nedostup said that in addition, since the last work session, the Board of Supervisors approved the performance agreement for Southwood on June 19.

Ms. Nedostup said that the factor favorable staff found with the application are that the rezoning request is consistent with the recommendations within the Southern and Western Neighborhood Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan. She said that the rezoning is within the priority area of the Southern and Western Neighborhood Master Plan, and that the rezoning is consistent with the majority of applicable neighborhood model principles, provides affordable housing that meets the policy within the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Nedostup said that the request allows for future connections with Biscuit Run Park, and the rezoning supports the county Board of Supervisors' strategic plan goal for revitalizing aging urban neighborhoods and is within an opportunity zone.

Ms. Nedostup said that the unfavorable factors that were described in detail in the staff report are that the rezoning request will add additional students to Cale Elementary School, which is over capacity with no plans at present time for expansion, and it will add additional traffic to Old Lynchburg Road and 5<sup>th</sup> Street Extended and impact existing intersections along the corridor. She said that improvements have been identified as high priority; however, funding has not been identified for those projects to date.

Ms. Nedostup asked Mr. Kamptner to come forward to provide an overview of the performance agreement.

Mr. Kamptner presented slides as well as a verbal presentation of the history of the project and how it has evolved into its present state in respect to the performance agreement. He said that in October 2016, the Board of Supervisors adopted its first resolution related to the project, identifying Southwood as a priority area and one of the county's designated development areas. Mr. Kamptner said that the project has also made its way into the Board of Supervisors' strategic

plan, both for Fiscal Years 17 – 19 and FY 20 – FY 22 strategic plan as part of its objectives to revitalize aging urban neighborhoods. He said that the board recognizes in the strategic plan the desire to partner with Habitat for Humanity to redevelop the site.

Mr. Kamptner explained the rationale as to why the board became involved with the project and to the county's collaboration with Habitat. He said that within the performance agreement, it notes that the county supports the construction of 75 Habitat-built or Habitat-funded affordable dwelling units within Phase I, with the possibility of an additional 80 ADUs being constructed in Phase I. Mr. Kamptner said that it also enables the redevelopment of a neighborhood that has been identified as having a concentration of sub-standard housing, through a non-displacement policy and by providing a mixed-use, mixed-residential development.

Mr. Kamptner said that the county's involvement also includes partnering with those investing in the project. He said that \$94 million is estimated to be invested in Phase I, with the ultimate investment in Phase II and subsequent phases (totaling about \$250 million). He said that the project would also achieve the Comprehensive Plan and strategic plan goals and objectives that are identified in the performance agreement.

Mr. Kamptner said that the performance agreement goes to some length in laying out the various policies that the project supports, which was intentional as the project is important and is different than the way the county has done business in the past. He said that it hits on a number of the Board of Supervisors' Comprehensive Plan policies.

Mr. Kamptner indicated to a slide, stating that the county would be making cash contributions and that the performance agreement lays out a number of milestones that Habitat will have to achieve before the funding begins. He said that first, there are a number of prerequisites to meet before any money is contributed by the county through the EDA, and that these prerequisites are intended to ensure that the county is satisfied, and that the project is financially viable. Mr. Kamptner said that a budget would be required as well as other documents and records to satisfy the county that the project is economically viable. He said that once this happens and the thresholds are met, there are cash contributions over a series of fiscal years totaling \$1.8 million, if all the milestones are reached.

Mr. Kamptner said that additionally, there will be synthetic tax increment financing. He explained that as the property starts to develop and the real property tax value on the land and the buildings increases, those taxes are collected by an agreement, the county will rebate funds of the real property tax collected in the amount of 100% of the tax collected in the first five years, then 50% in the five years following that, up to a total not to exceed \$1.4 million.

Mr. Kamptner said that the county's contribution under the performance agreement could be as much as \$3.2 million in addition to the \$675,000 that the county has already contributed to facilitate the project getting to its present state. He also said that \$2.25 million in grants have been rewarded so far for the project.

Mr. Kamptner said that there are also a number of clawbacks that are detailed in the performance agreement. He said that the reason for these is that this is the public's money, and the county wants to ensure that the community is receiving the value of the county's contribution.

Mr. Kamptner said that the key milestone for Phase I is reaching 75 ADUs that are either Habitat-

built or Habitat-contracted. He indicated on a slide and said that regarding the total of \$1.8 million, \$1.5 million is tied to milestones related to the 75 Habitat units, with an additional \$300,000 contribution if another affordable housing developer is able to construct up to 80 or more ADUs in Phase I.

Mr. Kamptner offered to answer any questions and noted that the proposal was approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 19 and by the County Development Authority on July 16.

Mr. Keller asked the commissioners if there were any questions. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Don Franco with Rod Bush and Gayle introduced himself and said that he was representing the design team for the Southwood project and for Habitat. He said that he had attended a prior Planning Commission meeting but that this was the first time he was attending in respect to this project. Mr. Franco said that he has been involved for years on the project and based on the input received from the prior meeting, there were many technical aspects of the submittal. He said that Ms. Mandy and he became more involved in rewriting the code of development and making it easier to read by consolidating the information. Mr. Franco said that much of the plan is still the same, and the team has attempted to clear up some of the confusion over the various points that were not coming across as intended in previous presentations and submittals. He said that as Ms. Nedostup indicated earlier, there were substantial changes made, including a reduction in the height of the buildings, which had been a major factor.

Mr. Franco said that one of the major changes made was moving to a finer grain layout of the blocks. He acknowledged there had been much discussion about whether Old Lynchburg Road should be a framework street and how to treat it, and that part of the confusion was that there are no buildings that will front onto Old Lynchburg Road. Mr. Franco said that a change made to make this more obvious was by making Block 2 its own block, and so nothing can be fronted onto Old Lynchburg Road. He said that there is a buffer of separation, and in addition to the 30-foot greenway or trail buffer, there is also setback from the area, which will help push buildings and infrastructure back and keep a rural feel for most of the road from Hickory and Old Lynchburg Road, south.

Mr. Franco said that at the intersection itself, the Comp Plan is being followed and though the height of the buildings has been reduced, there is still anticipation for bigger buildings and that planning is being done for this. He said that there is currently a 50-foot height instead of 65 feet, and part of the reasoning and justification for this is when it presented before, perspective-wise, there was a focus on the height of 65 feet. Mr. Franco asked the Commission to think about the project in terms of the intensity and how the continuum should be changing across the development itself. He asked the Commission to keep in mind that 35 feet is a single-family detached house, and that when thinking about it in these terms, 65 feet is the height for zones R-10 and R-15. Mr. Franco said that if the Comp Plan is calling for 6 to 34 units per acre, taller buildings should be expected there as the density desired to achieve. He said that looking at a height of 35 feet for a single-family detached house, and going to the center, the applicant felt that 50 feet is a good compromise to make the program work, but the additional height is needed to create that difference in intensity.

Mr. Franco said that clarification has been made in regard to where development can take place and how it is being used. He said that one of the other concerns that came up at the last

presentation was the active recreational space, and that there had been confusion as to what was being asked for. Mr. Franco said that across the board, there are requirements for active recreation and is translated into square feet and is flexible as to where it can be located. He said that in the table, Blocks 5, 6, 7, and 8 are grouped, and within this group, there are a number of different recreational amenities that can take place, ranging in 500 square feet to 2,000 square feet or more. Mr. Franco noted that planning is being done for square footage (not a tot lot) and this is being left open so that the community can do the programming for these items. He said that the requirements for code are being met for the recreational amenities.

Mr. Franco said that the parking modifications are still in the plan and acknowledged the pushback received from the last presentation, most of which was associated with the reduction in the parking requirements for the multi-family area. He said that he did not hear anything about relocating some of the off-site parking. Mr. Franco said that the focus on the parking modification is that everything read literature-wise speaks to how properties are overparked these days, especially for multi-family, and that the use is coming down. He said that looking at ITE and at his work with other apartment builders in town, there is a consensus of needing about 1.3 spaces per unit, as opposed to 2 spaces per unit being discussed and seen. Mr. Franco said that he believes the parking is appropriate and asked for the Commission's support on this before going to the Board of Supervisors but recognized that this is a topic that can be dealt with at the site plan level. He said that though it is not critical to solve immediately, it is critical because the desired density must be achieved on land that has many competing uses and referred to building heights, parking, open spaces, and amenities as factors. Mr. Franco said that these competing uses call for a reduction in unneeded parking and reiterated that 1.3 spaces per unit is the average need seen in the area, as opposed to 1.5 or 2 spaces per unit. He said that this is still being pursued within the document.

Mr. Franco said that the neighborhood center is where the major focus is. He presented a picture to explain the center in the perspective of Old Lynchburg Road that included three different elevations or renderings. Mr. Franco indicated to what it would look like, walking south, from the middle of Old Lynchburg Road looking onto the site. He said that there are new plantings there, along with a significant buffer that exists today and will continue to exist in the future. Mr. Franco said that with the buildings pushed back, they would be mostly out of view, except through a few tree openings and in some winter views. He said that the same was true for the entrance to Mosby Mountain – that it will be seen at the intersection, as the applicant sees is appropriate, and that Hickory Street is becoming the southern connector road and should not be hidden. Mr. Franco said that views have been reduced down to this single location and that the building is long against Hickory, with the short side being a bar building so that the façade or face towards Old Lynchburg Road is reduced as much as possible. He said that landscaping would be added in this area as well.

Mr. Franco zoomed into the same view from a perspective of standing in Old Lynchburg Road across from the site. He indicated to dark lines that represent etchings of the buildings and said that height-wise, they are much smaller than the trees because of the distance at which they are pushed back.

Mr. Franco presented another graphic and recalled that at the last presentation, one of the members of the community pointed out that using a reference would be nice. He explained the graphic is from the perspective of coming straight out of Mosby Mountain and indicated to a telephone pole that is 35 feet in height. Mr. Franco indicated to the sketching of the buildings

versus the trees from Google Earth and said that most of the buildings are screened off because of the distance.

Mr. Franco presented a picture of the main intersection and indicated to a yellow line he had added to represent the height of the 35-foot telephone pole as well as the height of a single-family detached house there. He said that perspective-wise, the building is 15 feet taller than this line but that it is not out of scale, stating that 50 feet is appropriate.

Mr. Franco acknowledged that his time to speak was almost up, and that the Commission likely had many questions.

Mr. Keller told Mr. Franco he could speak again once the Commission had heard from the public.

Mr. Keller said that Mr. Bivins would lead the process of hearing from the public.

Mr. Bivins said that there were 16 individuals who had signed up to speak but that this was not a limit and not to worry if one's name had not made the list. He acknowledged a number of members of the public standing and told them that if they agree with a point that is being made to please raise their hands rather than standing. Mr. Bivins asked the public that because there is simultaneous translation going on to please announce when speaking, and also to try to speak slowly to give the translator time to pick up comments and relay them to the community. He explained the 3-minute time allotment per speaker and how the time signaling lights work. Mr. Bivins said that because of the number of speakers present, he would be utilizing hard stops.

Mr. Sunshine Mathon, Executive Director of Piedmont Housing Alliance, introduced himself and said that he stands before the Commission as a resident of Albemarle County and as a committed advocate for low-wealth individuals and families throughout the area who serves to include their voices at the planning table.

Mr. Mathon said that in recent years, the Charlottesville region has become a nationally-recognized epicenter of cutting-edge, resident-led redevelopment efforts by and with historically poor communities of color. He said that these transformational developments are recognized as exceptional and nationally significant as they are being planned on the community's terms. Mr. Mathon said that they honor and build upon the community members' aspirations for the community's needs and for their future.

Mr. Mathon said that as an architect by training, and as an executive director by profession, and in his work with Friendship Court residents to co-design their future community, he could say with complete conviction that the resulting redevelopment plan at Friendship Court is profoundly better for this rare inclusion process. He said that not only does it reflect the residents' aspirations, but it also responds to the needs of the city and surrounding neighborhoods in thoughtful ways that enhance the civic infrastructure. Mr. Mathon said that this kind of process takes unconventional pathways, as with Southwood planning, and has untraditional responses to civic conundrums that requires embracing a different kind of wisdom that doesn't always "check the boxes" in expected ways. He said that at the same time, any such development must also align with the jurisdiction's comp plan, reflecting long-term strategic goals linked to growth, uses, and densities typologies.

Mr. Mathon said that in all regards, reflected in the rezoning application, his professional opinion is that the Commission has in front of it an extraordinary plan. He said that not only is the overall

plan reflective of the aspirations of the residents, as it should be, but upon review of the county's comp plan goals, he sees alignment at almost every level. Mr. Mathon said that regarding scale of density, it is in line with (and respectfully below) the future land use map designated 34 units per acre. He said that alignment with the goals can also be seen in the planned neighborhood center at the intersection of Hickory Street and Old Lynchburg Road; in the planned trail connections between Southwood, Biscuit Run, and ultimately the Rivanna Trail network; and in the task of the provision of affordable housing within a mixed-income development model which, in his professional experience and given the scale of the site, requires joint investment by non-profits, public jurisdictions, and private market rate builders to be both financially viable and civically balanced.

Mr. Mathon said that the rezoning request, explicitly acknowledged by staff as consistent with the recommendations of the Neighborhoods Master Plan and the Comp Plan, does a remarkable job at addressing every guideline and goal in terms that also address residents' hopes for their futures. He noted that after reviewing staff commentary on the rezoning request, the only two factors unfavorable (impact on schools and added traffic) are truly unfavorable only if the county fails to follow through on its own self-determined long-range planning. Mr. Mathon said that the Comp Plan itself calls for increased residential density in this region and, by definition, this directly translates to impact on schools and an increase in traffic. He said that the county cannot call for density and then say "no" when someone offers to fulfill on it. Mr. Mathon said that it is the responsibility of Albemarle County – not of Southwood residents – to fulfill its end of the Comp Plan bargain by addressing transportation and educational infrastructure that is consistent with its own Comp Plan goals.

Mr. Mathon said that in closing, as an Albemarle County resident, he strongly supports the Southwood rezoning application because it demonstrates a future defined by the community itself and that further, as a design professional, he strongly supports the Southwood rezoning application based on its merits as a planning document.

Mr. Bivins asked the public that if they are representing an organization, to state the organization and otherwise provide their addresses.

Mr. Edgar Lara, a homeowner at The Woodlands of Charlottesville (which is less than a mile away from Southwood) said that he strongly supports the rezoning. He said that the construction and development of new homes is happening all around and wonders why there is so much opposition to development in Southwood, if there is as much opposition at other developments, and why this one stands out so much.

Mr. Lara said that he believes there are many positive changes that the proposed development will bring, and is familiar with the Southwood community, its people and the development plans. He said that Charlottesville and Albemarle County are in desperate need of more affordable housing, and this is one of too few plans in process to begin addressing this.

Mr. Lara said that he knows community members have contributed substantial efforts in deciding what the plan and the community will look like, and that these people, their families and their efforts, are what makes the Southwood community and its culture – not the trailers that currently exist. He said that the neighborhoods that propose the development have a desire to maximize the value of their investment, and that he doesn't believe the proposed changes will hurt their values. Mr. Lara said that he cares about property values too, and that he cares about the future

of the community. He said that what is happening at Southwood is positive in many ways and that he wants them to succeed.

Mr. Lara said that he hopes that everyone who can make decisions about the proposal can get behind it as well.

Annie Stupp, a resident of the City of Charlottesville, stated that her husband is a native of Albemarle County and that they are looking for a home in the county to purchase. She said that though the search is difficult, she knows they will find one eventually. Ms. Stupp said that for too many people, however, there is no hope of finding a home to purchase, let alone rent, and that she strongly supports the rezoning of Southwood.

Ms. Stupp said that the Southwood redevelopment project will keep a vibrant community intact, create affordable home ownership and rental opportunities, and bring much needed services that will benefit the entire population of the county. She said that it is also within the vision of the Comp Plan and furthers the county's affordable housing goals.

Ms. Stupp said that in the Comp Plan, this area is designated as a development area and is named as an urban neighborhood. She said that changing to Neighborhood Model District supports not just residential places, but places of worship, schools, etc. Ms. Stupp said that the rezoning would make public resources much more accessible to countless Albemarle County residents who are coming into Charlottesville along Old Lynchburg Road and is in the interest of the greater population.

Ms. Stupp said that she was sure there would be folks speaking in support of affordable housing, in theory, but not in reality – not in their backyards. She said that some are concerned about Habitat selling parcels to for-profit developers. Ms. Stupp said that Southwood is intended to become a mixed-income community, however, and this means that market rate homes are critical to creating a diversity of residents and ensuring that as many affordable homes can be built using revenues from these sales. She said that if one doesn't have a problem with affordable housing, one should not have a problem with creating a mixed-income neighborhood that enables the financing to work.

Ms. Stupp said that there are some concerns about aesthetics, and that some neighbors are concerned about vegetation, the heights of buildings, and the rural character of the neighborhood. She said that vegetation grows back, and that this area is not rural but is designated as urban in the Comp Plan. Ms. Stupp said that the difference in height from two to four stories, from 50 feet to 65 feet, should be negligible when considering that much needed housing and resources are being provided with only moderately increased intensity. She said that she hears that people are concerned about the view while driving along Old Lynchburg Road for about two minutes.

Ms. Stupp said that it has been very convenient for many neighbors to pretend that Southwood doesn't exist, acknowledging that it has been hidden behind trees for so long but that it is just as an important part of the community as every surrounding neighborhood, including the much more affluent ones. She said that many Southwood residents have lived in the neighborhood for 50 or more years, are pillars of the community, and have worked incredibly hard to design a beautiful neighborhood and chose to place the intensity along Old Lynchburg Road, where it belongs. Ms. Stupp said that they are choosing to build Phase I in a place where no one currently lives, so no one would be displaced, and that this is an example of putting the greater good of the community

above one's own self-interests.

Ms. Stupp said that the area has an affordable housing crisis that has been made worse by fear of change, fear of density, and fear of people who are different. She said that today, there is a chance to make history, and the Commission has a chance to make history. Ms. Stupp said that one cannot say they support affordable housing without supporting the density, zoning, and financing that makes it possible. She asked that the Commission puts the interest of 1,500 hardworking, close-knit Southwood community members and the interest of the entire population above the interest from a few.

Mr. Keir Zander, Vice President of the Community Investment Collaborative (a local non-profit that supports under-resourced entrepreneurs), said that two years ago when Habitat launched their community-led planning process, the CIC started hearing significant interest from Southwood residents for small business support. He said that in the past two years, the CIC has discovered that, like so many immigrant communities across the region, Southwood is made up of an incredible entrepreneurial energy, with more than 80 small businesses currently owned by Southwood residents and dozens more potential entrepreneurs with the passion and skills to be a small business owner. Mr. Zander said that these people wonder if they have the resources in order to be competitive.

Mr. Zander said that for residents of Southwood, their business not only represents the possibility of social mobility, but the desire to live in a community where the small businesses of their neighbors are represented, visible, and are supported by their neighborhood. He said that residents feel that one of the details that makes a community their own is the representation of Latino businesses within their neighborhoods.

Mr. Zander said that one of the major barriers these businesses face is access to convenient and affordable commercial spaces. He said that across Charlottesville and Albemarle County, retail vacancy is less than 3%, meaning that extremely few spaces are convenient to this community and that the spaces that are currently available have significantly inflated prices. Mr. Zander said that many of the businesses that currently exist in Southwood rely on the patronage of their fellow residents. He said that the pricing of the commercial spaces located in Albemarle County forces residents to consider locating their businesses outside of the county where, unfortunately, there may not be as much demand for their goods and services.

Mr. Zander said that the Southwood rezoning request helps the community support these small businesses. He said that a building height of four floors enables the developer to put desperately needed commercial spaces on the ground floor. Mr. Zander said that these commercial spaces will offer affordable incubation space for small business owners, reducing a significant barrier to business viability. He said that additionally, the location of these commercial spaces will benefit the overall community as a whole and offer a walkable destination for Southwood residents to shop, dine, and access amenities, and supports a complete vision of what a thriving community means – not just affordable housing, but also economic opportunity.

Mr. Zander said that the community-led planning process that has led the project to this point is a tremendous achievement. He said that across the region, it is consistently heard that a significant concern for residents is access to affordable housing and the opportunity for economic mobility. Mr. Zander said that this rezoning proposal is how both are delivered to the community, and that it is essential that Habitat be able to partner with market rate developers in order to

subsidize the cost of land development. He said that this partnership funds the engineering of roads and infrastructure of sewer and water management which, in turn, allows Habitat to offer 0% interest mortgages to Southwood residents.

Ms. Martha Smythe, a resident of Charlottesville, said that she is interested in the whole issue of affordable housing. She said that when she first learned of the Southwood plan about a year ago, she was blown away by the community' involvement and desire to not just make the housing better than trailers, but to offer a range of benefits to the community and neighbors in regard to retail and services areas.

Ms. Smythe said that she feels that a run-down trailer park – which is how the neighborhood has been characterized in some of the writings and reports she has read – and the urban issue it represents cannot be at any advantage to the property values of nearby communities, neighborhoods, developments, and homeowner associations. She said that what is being planned and offered here improves those values for the other neighborhoods, as it will be a lovely community that offers not only services, but a beautiful neighborhood once completed.

Ms. Smythe said that she supported the points made by Mr. Mathon, Mr. Lara, Ms. Stupp, and Mr. Zander and was impressed by the way the plan meets the goals of the community plan, master plan, and addresses strategic issues. She said that it is a thorough job that has been done, and the negotiations and adjustments that have been heard so far are typical of the attitude that the people involved with this proposal have towards the future.

Mr. Aaron Winston, an organizer with Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ) Charlottesville and a member of the Charlottesville Low Income Housing Coalition, urged the commissioners to pass the proposal as written. He said that it is an important and needed avenue for tackling the affordable housing crisis the region is facing over Charlottesville, Albemarle County and the region and that the county's data backs this up. Mr. Winston said that the need for deep affordability for folks making 30% or less of an area median income expands well out into the urban ring and beyond into the county, and that Southwood is one of the biggest concentrations of existing deeply affordable housing stock. He said that the project, as it is written, is a good way to ensure that the affordability will continue into the future.

Mr. Winston said that he feels the numbers laid out in the report show that this is a workable project, and that the financing is sound, as written. He said that the mixed-income, mixed-use model is one of the best ways to ensure that the affordability is "baked in" and that it extends down into parts of the income spectrum that are not serviced by LIHTC or other affordable housing models.

Mr. Winston said that he wanted to underscore the fact that many of the criticisms of the project are coming from a place of insidious classism and racism. He said that when communities that are majority-white and majority-affluent are dictating the terms that community made up most of people of color and working-class individuals, one must ask what the motivations are and why the values and interests of certain members of certain communities overcome the needs and values of more vulnerable members of the community. Mr. Winston said that when these criticisms are seen, one must ask whose side they are on and urged the Commission, if in doubt, to err on the side of members of the community who are most vulnerable and have the most to lose – and gain – from the project.

Mr. Bivins asked the public to please refrain from clapping.

Ms. Elaina Cleveland, a Habitat owner at the Wickham Pond neighborhood, stated how Habitat has changed her life. She said that she has a 14-year-old son and before Habitat, they used to spend all their money on rent. Ms. Cleveland said that their lives have changed completely, that the neighborhood is wonderful, and that there was no way they could have afforded a home there if it was not for Habitat.

Mr. Steve Onstork, a resident of Albemarle County whose property borders Mountain Valley and Mosby Mountain, said that his office is at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> Street at West Main Street. He said that 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Old Lynchburg Road acts as his family's "main street," as they shop and commute on 5<sup>th</sup> Street and it is "home" to them.

Mr. Onstork said that rather than listing all the boxes the project checks that had already been listed, he would speak to a perspective that the Commission has a great opportunity to reflect and respect all the time the Board, Planning Commission staff, and community have investment into all the county ordinances and initiatives. He said that the Commission has a chance to reflect and respect all the time the Southwood community and Habitat have invested into the initiative and the time the planning staff investment in reviewing the project.

Mr. Onstork said that since 5<sup>th</sup> Street is his "Main Street," he is excited that Southwood will have a front door on 5<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that the project and its commercial center, welcomes Southwood to Albemarle County and wishes it the best. Mr. Onstork said that Hickory Street and Old Lynchburg Road are important to him because it is his "Main Street" and that he is excited for a center that will have businesses, restaurants, and shops that are locally owned. He said that he is far more excited about this project than he ever was about 5<sup>th</sup> Street Station. Mr. Onstork said that if there is a traffic problem on 5<sup>th</sup> Street, one knows where to point.

Mr. Onstork said that the Commission has an opportunity to do something great, and that is to approve the project, bring it forward as proposed, and be part of a great addition to Albemarle County.

Mr. Overton McGee said that he no longer works for Charlottesville Habitat but was Executive Director when Habitat bought Southwood in 2007 and is delighted to see the proposal. He pointed out how consistent the plans for Southwood have been over the years, explaining that Southwood was already part of the county's designated growth area when it began to be assessed in 2006. Mr. McGee said that at that point, Habitat began discussing with county officials the possibility of redeveloping Southwood to a mixed-income, mixed-use development that would include affordable housing. He said that for the current residents, many of whom are long-time residents, the plan was always for it to be mixed-use and mixed-income, with a wide range of incomes.

Mr. McGee said that the plan Habitat discussed with county officials in 2006 was 900 units plus commercial space, with some units to be built by Habitat and some by private builders. He said that the lots to be sold to private builders would help pay for the affordable units that would be sold or rented to the current residents. Mr. McGee said that Ms. Minor, who owned Southwood, sold it to Habitat because of this plan. He said that because it was in the county designated growth area, other developers were interested in buying Southwood and having it rezoned to a higher density. Mr. McGee said that Ms. Minor sold it to Habitat because they had a plan to prevent the displacement of current residents.

Mr. McGee said that after Habitat bought Southwood, Albemarle County revised the Comp Plan to show Southwood as appropriate for mixed-use and mixed-income (up to 900 units). He said that at present, Habitat is applying for a 700-unit mixed-income development, which he hopes the Commission will approve.

Mr. McGee said that Southwood residents are already neighbors and approving this will help them create a stronger neighborhood.

Ms. Estephanie Lopez said that she was speaking on behalf of her mother, Ms. Fernandez. She started by telling the Commission about a dream her mother has for her family that she longs for and brings her happiness, as it will provide a better future for her children. Ms. Lopez said that the dream is to give them a place where they feel comfortable and safe to develop healthy and happy. She said that so far, she feels as if this dream is about to be achieved with the help of Habitat and all the help that has been done to help the homes for which sufficient permission from the county must be attained. Ms. Lopez said that having a decent place as a home would bless their lives with tranquility and unity among neighbors – tranquility because her children and others would have a place to grow, and unity because as neighbors, there would be connected that has united them through working together on the project.

Ms. Lopez said that recently, the community has worked to carry out the redevelopment at Southwood, which has consisted of many hours of neighborhood planning, attending meetings with designers and engineers, inviting neighbors and working on whatever is needed to achieve the results they are looking for. Ms. Lopez thanked the Commission for its attention and expressed hope that their efforts would persuade them to approve the Southwood development project that will help the community meet its goals.

Mr. Jordan Leahy, an Albemarle County resident and homeowner on Oak Hill Drive in the neighborhood adjacent to Southwood, spoke in support of the Southwood redevelopment plan and the community's efforts to create and implement an effective and inclusive plan and strategy for its project. He said that he also wanted to address some of the concerns expressed by the nearby Mosby Mountain Community Association (MMCA).

Mr. Leahy said that while he appreciates the MMCA's articulated concern with third-party profiting exploitation, it seems evident that MMCA's primary desires are that the neighbors at Southwood are neither seen, nor heard. He said that the MMCA's letter dated May 29 literally requests that the construction be blocked by a visual barrier ("build the wall"). Mr. Leahy said that it seems suspicious to him that their central concern has to do with the sensory changes to the neighborhood, and that in their July 20 letter, they note their worry related to the change to the "look and feel of our locale," noting that one of the primary changes would be that residents of Southwood would live markedly and visibly closer to Mosby Mountain. He said that this line of argument seems highly suspect. Mr. Leahy said that relatedly, having grown up on a dairy farm, he knows what "BS" smells like.

Mr. Leahy said that MMCA had also noted traffic concerns regarding Old Lynchburg Road and the police presence necessary to facilitate traffic flow during rush hour. He said that he uses this intersection each day to venture anywhere beyond the neighborhood, especially during weekday rush hour and can clarify that the police presence there is to assist with student arrival and drop-off at the Covenant School (located off of Hickory Street). Mr. Leahy said that law enforcement is

not present at other times and that he has never seen them outside the Convenciant School's academic calendar. He said that if traffic and economic exploitation are concerns, he would ask how many MMCA folks were pushing back when it was announced that there was a Starbucks going in just south of 5<sup>th</sup> Street Station.

Mr. Leahy said that the MMCA couches its concerns in language that purports to be supportive of the Southwood residence and community, but that is an expression of a colonial's mindset. He said that this is how well-intentioned white folks perpetuate systemic white supremacy. Mr. Leahy said that the neighbors in Southwood and their community predate Mosby Mountain and the other subdivisions that the MMCA mentions. He said that the plans were well-developed and curated by the residents alongside their architects and engineers and that they know the plans, understand them, and their work and craft in them should be respected.

Ms. Jennifer Flores said that she was reading a statement on behalf of Gui Alvarado. "My name is Gui Alvarado. I have lived in Southwood for more than 20 years. I arrived in Southwood before Habitat bought the trailer park, and I have seen all the changes that have happened over the years. We want to live in a place that is clean, safe, and peaceful. When I came here with my young boys, they attended the schools of Cale, Walton, and Monticello. My youngest son had amazing help from the Boys and Girls Club. He was the first Hispanic child to attend the club. For the entire community, the Boys and Girls Club was essential for the children's growth.

"The re-urbanization is very important to us but most of all, for our children. We are a hardworking community who follows the laws of this country, such as paying taxes. We like living in Southwood because it's close to the best schools in the area. The location is good because we are close to the stores, to the highway, and at the same time we are not within the city limits. We are close to our jobs, and we now have public transportation.

"We are very happy and excited for the urbanization because we need better streets, lighting, and a better drainage system. We have a very old system. There is also no good signal for internet or cable, and it can't be improved because of how old the system is.

"The most important thing is the water and the drainage. It is a necessity and it needs to be replaced. It is very uncomfortable to live like this. I share a septic tank with my neighbors, and it is not nice. We do not move to another place because we do not have the money to pay rent.

"Something else that is dangerous is living in the middle of a forest. Although it is very pretty and healthy, it is a huge danger every time there is a storm. We fear that a tree – or even in the best case scenario, a branch – will fall on top of our trailers.

"When you don't have these problems, you don't understand how it is to live with these dangers and discomforts. Only the people who live in Southwood know our needs. We want a safer place to live as well as more services. Because Southwood is an old trailer park, it is no longer functional.

"We also know that we have to sacrifice something in order to obtain the money for such an expensive project. Though land along Old Lynchburg Road has always been vacant, so that the sale does not affect us, but instead it helps us to construct these economic homes. We as a community know what it's like to have to make sacrifices in order to obtain something – we do it every day.

“We look for solutions to make our community to look better. We know our plans for re-urbanization well because we have worked for more than two years to create them together. We met every week for this. These are not the plans of one sole person, but of the community as a whole. It was a lot of work in the beginning, but we adapted, and we learned how to work together.

“If you would like, you can come to Southwood and we can show you, step by step, how we came to this great plan. Of course, the architects helped us and that’s how we learned, but we all put in effort. We would like for you to help us to keep ongoing with the urbanization. Thank you.”

Mr. Ken Garrison of Wood Singleton Lane, representing the Mosby Mountain Homeowners Association, said that in contrary to some of the statements, the association is totally in support of the Southwood progress. He said that the association believes that progress is being made with the communication with Habitat, and he wanted to make comments to where this might go one step farther to make a good project great.

Mr. Garrison said that the Commission has a challenge in that when it asks for density, it gets offsetting problems. He noted these have already been mentioned in the staff report, including the overcrowding at Cale Elementary, and that there would have to be a way to figure out how to deal with this. Mr. Garrison said that there is traffic coming onto Old Lynchburg Road, and there has to be a funding stream and a project to deal with that.

Mr. Garrison said that as he watched the power go out on Sunday night, that is at the back end of the power grid and at some point, the power grid will need to be updated as more communities are added to the area.

Mr. Garrison said that from the 35-foot-tall telephone pole perspective, which is useful, it is interesting that this is exactly where the front edge of the building is being planned when he walked the property with Habitat. He said that it is up close to the street and will tower over since the trees are going to be cleaned out. Mr. Garrison noted that while there is conversation about putting plantings on a 30-foot trail buffer, there is a limitation of what can be planted in a 30-foot buffer, so only 10 feet of vegetation would be achieved. He revisited Ms. Firehock’s comment from the previous meeting that two stories are a more appropriate level and would fit better within the community, and that the tree structure should try to be achieved to fit within the look and feel. Mr. Garrison thanked the Commission and expressed appreciation for their difficult decision to make.

Mr. Andres Pacheco, who is new to the Southwood neighborhood, said that when he heard this project would happen, he was very excited about it. He said that this is a great project, and great for the neighborhood and city. Mr. Pacheco said that the county doesn’t only need this project, but more like it. He said that this type of projects needs to be in the city, the county, and everywhere. He said that they need to also be placed closer to public transportation.

Mr. Pacheco said that he wanted to challenge the Commission to do more – to consider that this alone will not solve all problems, but that more of these projects are needed. He said that projects like this should happen everywhere, and that he wants everyone to work hard for that.

Mr. Pacheco said that he supported the density, mixed-use, and mixed-income. He said that there is one point that he doesn’t yet understand, and that is what is pushing the design team to put the

four-story building so close to the street. Mr. Pacheco said that he would challenge them to work creatively to increase the density but give themselves a way to scale the building back better from the street. He said that there are ways to do this while increasing the density. Mr. Pacheco said that he wants the project to move forward, and that if a creative solution cannot be achieved to do this, that the Commission should approve the project to proceed. He said that he wants the project should be done right for the neighborhood and the rest of the city, and that more of this should be done so that one single project doesn't carry all the stress and challenges. Mr. Pacheco thanked everyone and said that the project is the right thing to do.

Mr. Brian Hammill with the Mosby Mountain Community Association echoed the sentiments of Mr. Pacheco and Mr. Garrison that while the MMCA is in full support of the project, they do have concerns with the infrastructure in the area. He said that, as stated earlier, this may be a county problem, but without knowing what the plans are to address it, the MMCA is concerned.

Mr. Preston Miller, a resident of Mosby Mountain, said that though some of the residents had concerns at the beginning of the project regarding preserving the rural nature of the Old Lynchburg Road entrance corridor, they believe the plan is acceptable and preserves this nature. He said that having a setback and foliage for screening of the buildings is good, and that the community center should really be at the center of the community instead of at its edge. Mr. Miller said that he believes all the commercial buildings should be in the center of the community. He said that looking at development now, that's where the buildings are, such as the Boys and Girls Club. Mr. Miller said that the center is also where the parks for the residents and their children to congregate should be located, rather than on the edge. He said that adopting these points into the plan would be good and will help the community and the people of Southwood.

Mr. Bivins invited anyone who was not on the list to come forward to speak, if they wished. He also expressed thanks to the county's facilities people for opening the back of the auditorium to allow more space for the public and encouraged applause from the public for the county's facilities department.

Mr. Luis Oyola, a resident of Old Lynchburg Road and a neighbor of Southwood, introduced himself as an organizer with the Legal Aid Justice Center, but said that he would be speaking on a personal capacity. He said that he submitted a letter to the Commission about a month and a half ago.

Mr. Oyola said that he is in support of the redevelopment as proposed by Habitat for the Neighborhood Model District with the placement of the commercial building as planned, adding that he trusts the process. He said that there is a worthwhile aesthetic comparison, for those who are concerned about the aesthetics, on the stretch between the I-64 exit and Shadwell roughly to Glenmore, which is a very wealthy country club neighborhood which he feels is relatively comparable to Mosby Mountain. Mr. Oyola said that along this stretch, one can see a mix of all sorts of uses, such as commercial businesses, a quarry, a gas station, cow pastures. He said that as far as he knows, the Glenmore residents are living just fine with all of the mixed use along the way to their residence.

Mr. Oyola said that he had new affordable housing in his backyard where he lives on Old Lynchburg Road and said that he has been fine with it being literally in his backyard, and proud that Albemarle County is able to provide this housing in light of all the people being pushed out of Charlottesville. He said that one must admit that the city is simply growing that way, and it is a

matter of whether or not the county wants the growth to happen responsibly.

Mr. Oyola said that it's very rare that residents come out this hard in support of redevelopment as opposed to against it. He said that this must be honored and that Habitat's processes to include the residents must be recognized, and that this process should be nourished, adding that other developers should take note as the Charlottesville metro area continues to grow into Albemarle County.

Mr. Morgan Butler with the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) said that as a number of the speakers had already noted, there are many positive aspects of the proposal and that one of the most impressive, in his opinion, was the involvement of the current Southwood residents in its design. He said that based on the input of the residents who are involved with the design process, it seems as though the proposal reflects so much of their input and was designed with their needs and desires in mind.

Mr. Butler said that the SELC would like to commend the team – the Habitat team, as well as the resident design team – for their hard work and what has been brought before the Commission. He noted, however, that there are a few areas in which the SELC believes additional clarity would be beneficial, with one major area being the use of the greenspace on the site. Mr. Butler said that the code of development notes that it is important to the resident community that the streams and other natural features that surround much of the site be preserved and honored. He said that the design proposes to do that by designating Blocks 1 and 2 along the perimeter of the site as greenspace but added that the code of development notes that utilities will need to be located in stream buffers and built across steep slopes.

Mr. Butler added that storm water facilities are shown in both greenspace blocks in the concept stormwater plan. He referred to the table of non-residential uses on page 11 of the code of development, which shows various other uses allowed in Blocks 1 and 2 by-right, including electric and gas lines, wireless service facilities, and farmers markets which could be a fine use for greenspace, but could also include large new structures and land disturbances that can run counter to the idea of minimizing environmental impacts.

Mr. Butler referred to Table 7 on page 15 of the code of development and said that it is also confusing in this regard. He said that it indicates that roughly 2 acres of Block 1 will be preserved, and that close to 6 acres of that same block will be conserved. Mr. Butler said that Block 2 is similarly divided between preservation and conservation, yet there is no indication in the code of development as to how those terms differ from each other or what they mean in the context in the COD.

Mr. Butler said that the SELC is not suggesting that a trail is the only disturbance that should be allowed in Blocks 1 and 2, but they are concerned that the COD leaves an open question about just what can and will be built in the greenspace, begging the question of whether the greenspace will embody the importance that the residents place in preserving and honoring the site's sensitive ecological zones. He said that the COD needs to be clarified in this respect so that commitments and expectations are clear. Mr. Butler said that these clarifications shouldn't require major changes or stall this positive project but that they are important to nailing down key environmental commitments and demonstrating that affordable housing can be built in the development areas and protect the sensitive environmental resources in those areas at the same time.

Ms. Donna Gasapo (a resident of Sherwood Manor, off of 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Old Lynchburg Road, about a mile or less from Southwood) said that she has lived in the Charlottesville area for almost 25 years and was previously a resident of the City of Charlottesville. She said that she has been very involved with the Public Housing Association of Residents and has watched how residents in public housing created their positive vision plan for the redevelopment of their communities. Ms. Gasapo said that having a chance to see the Southwood community do something similar is exciting.

Ms. Gasapo said that she hopes the county doesn't make the same mistake the city did in pushing back so much on a plan that has been developed by directly-impacted community members. She said that she hopes the Commission helps the community to push their plan forward. Ms. Gasapo said that it is a beautiful and visionary plan and should be a model for how other low-income communities get to drive their redevelopment and have the opportunity to make decisions about their communities, their goals, and their neighbors.

Ms. Gasapo reiterated that she has lived in the area for a long time and said that one of her favorite places to go is Walnut Creek. She said that she's driven up and down Old Lynchburg Road to get to Walnut Creek for many years, and that the stretch of road has changed so much in the past 25 years. Ms. Gasapo said that she hasn't seen the kind of pushback for the development that's happen there as she has seen for the Southwood development, and that the Commission should consider the kind of racism and classism involved that other speakers had mentioned earlier.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was anyone else from the public who did not sign up to speak but would like to.

Mr. Gerardo Martinez said that (through a translator) that as a Southwood resident, it is very important for the project to happen. He said that the Commission was responsible to understand that the residents work very hard and have contributed very much to the development of this community. Mr. Martinez said that in this world, there are many rich people, people with some money, and people with little money, and poor people. He said that everyone has the right to have dignified housing to live in.

Mr. Martinez said that at the recent wedding of the English prince and Megan Markle, he was reminded of a story of someone who said that, "It's not important the color of your skin (red, pink, or green). We are all human beings, and our blood is all red."

Mr. Bivins asked if anyone else from the public wanted to come forward.

Ms. Guadalupe Manuel-Flores said that she supported the Southwood redevelopment. She said that she wanted to speak about she and her family. Ms. Manuel-Flores said that she is the oldest child, with two younger sisters, and that they live with their mother and father in Southwood. She said that she's lived in Southwood as long as she could remember, and that she and her sisters are members of the Boys and Girls Club, where they have met all their friends who have also become their family.

Ms. Manuel-Flores said that she has worked closely with the plans for redevelopment for her community, and that she and the community acknowledge the struggles and difficulties that can come up with this large project. She says the community is all for it and they will figure it out

together, along the way. Ms. Manuel-Flores said that this has been done together, as a community, and that she hoped the Commission would approve the Southwood redevelopment.

Mr. James Pierce, CEO of the Boys and Girls Club of Central Virginia, expressed the club's support of the Southwood community, of Habitat of Greater Charlottesville, and for the redevelopment proposal. He said that there was no better partner in redevelopment than the Southwood community and Habitat of Greater Charlottesville. Mr. Pierce said that the families that lives in Charlottesville area model of collaborative and innovation and that he has seen enough 5K races, cookouts, and community soccer games to know firsthand. He asked if the county wouldn't like to see more of these qualities (collaboration and innovation) in the community.

Mr. Pierce said that there was a chance here to include, rather than to exclude, and that he votes for the former. He said that at every turn, Habitat and the residents of Southwood have made the Boys and Girls Clubs welcome, and he hopes they have returned the favor to thousands of kids over the years. Mr. Pierce said that he knows that when the Southwood community flourishes, he is convinced the county will flourish to an even greater degree.

Ms. Rose Glasco said that she is one of the oldest members of the Southwood community and has lived there for over 40 years. She said that she and her fellow neighbors have worked very hard over the past 2-2.5 years coming up with the redevelopment plan, and that she knows more about slopes and grades and roads than she had ever cared to.

Ms. Glasco said that she is looking forward to the Commission approving the request because she would love to go somewhere that is safe, explaining that anytime there is a storm and that the winds are estimated at 40 mph or more, she and her daughter are afraid. She said that the trees in the neighborhood are very old and though beautiful, are rotten. Ms. Glasco said that a limb fell on her house during the last storm on Sunday with the winds being so high.

Ms. Glasco said that there has been discussion about affordable housing for Southwood residents, but noted that it is not only for Southwood, but for anyone in Charlottesville in Albemarle who wants to be able to afford a house. She was reminded of a verse from a song that said that, "We're closer than we think we are," and expressed her hope that the Commission would help them get even closer.

Mr. Keller asked for the applicant to once again come forward and finish where he had left off, as well as respond to the public if he wished.

Mr. Franco said that he wanted to answer some of the questions that had been heard from the Commission at the last presentation. He presented a drawing and recalled a question from the last presentation, as well as from the past weeks, about how the project would happen – the plan, the concept, and how the phases fold in. Mr. Franco said that frankly that much of this is up in the air, and it has been hard to nail down and present solid information to the Commission.

Mr. Franco referred back to the drawing and said that he feels it represents what the project will look like coming into the future and what the plan is. He indicated to Phase I on the drawing and to the remainder of Southwood and said that similarly to the way Phase I is developing, where Block 5 is described as the "village," the indicated area was primarily where the replacement housing would occur and where the site planning would be done by the residents as they move

in. Mr. Franco said that the affordable housing would “bleed into” the other blocks, but this was the main focus.

Mr. Franco said that the main focus in the future blocks will be the center blocks as well, and that in all likelihood, the next blocks or phases to develop will be two phases which he indicated to on the drawing. He acknowledged there were questions the last time about “failing infrastructure” and what that meant and explained that this refers to the water and sewer and the septic fields that are there. Mr. Franco said that everything to the south of Hickory Street is on septic fields and that they are failing. He said that there are currently issues with septic waters coming up out of the ground in certain places, with water being consistent, and with the infrastructure for it.

Mr. Franco said that the decision that needed to be made whether to invest in this infrastructure or to redevelop and explained that the decision was to redevelop because making an investment in the infrastructure would still comprise of multimillion-dollar investments but wouldn’t fix the housing and drainage issues, nor would it create the mixed income community. He said that in terms of the failing infrastructure and the need to redevelop, this is one of the reasons why.

Mr. Franco said that the drawing shows that the general concept will have market rate units on the outside of the community, with the recognition that those are standard development neighborhood lots that the market rate buyer would embrace. He said that the internal areas would be more programmed by the residents at a site plan level. Mr. Franco indicated to an intersection on the drawing where he said that the center would spread across initially. He indicated to the taller buildings, and to dots that represent special locations (e.g. special tree, special gathering locations). Mr. Franco explained that those special locations would be incorporated into the planning in future phases.

Mr. Franco noted on the drawing how the greenspaces work together. He reiterated that the general idea is that the residents would program each additional phase and, as such, some of the core roads such as Hickory and Bitternut are there, but much of the planning as far as what the project will look and feel like is still up in the air.

Mr. Franco said that this hopefully addresses some of the Commission’s concerns as to how this works into the adjacent phases. He said that the comments heard earlier from some of the speakers dealt with the heights of the buildings, and that one thing to point out is the stepback that occurs in the design standards for the neighborhood center. Mr. Franco said that in order to get to the 50-foot height, there will be a stepback, resulting in seeing three stories from Old Lynchburg Road, and stepped back is where the four stories would be visible, coming out of the ground. He said that this is very important, as the height is going to be there.

Mr. Franco said that he knows this would not completely address the concerns of the neighbors, who he noted have been great to work with and he has had open discussions with. He said that the solution the project leans towards at this point is that, with recognition the neighbors will probably see the buildings at that location, a position on the ARB would be offered to the neighbors which would help them look at and vet the architecture of the buildings. Mr. Franco said that he felt this was a good solution and is similar to what the county has done in the past by engaging the concerned parties and stakeholders.

Mr. Franco said that the phases had been discussed and, as far as to how it all would happen, it would be a sort of “leapfrog” process where the green fields are being used to start with. He

indicated on the drawing to where residents would go in the first phase and noted there are 75 families committed to the first cohort. Mr. Franco said that this would open up about 75 opportunities within the park and give Habitat the opportunity to do some rearranging of people to open up the next area to develop. He indicated on the drawing to where the area would likely be but noted that this depends on where the 75 families would live and what other people would come into the area. Mr. Franco indicated to the next phase to develop, once there is consolidation, and that holes would come up to develop into the next area each time. He said that this would go in a stepped process in order to create openings because non-displacement (especially non-displacement outside the project) is very important to the community and to Habitat.

Mr. Franco said that the question has come up about funding would work. He said that the important thing to walk away with is that it's a great opportunity. Mr. Franco said that the county has made a \$3.2 million investment and at this point in time, this is rolling over into a \$16 million cash drive that is bringing outside monies (state and federal) into the community to help pay for and make this project work. He said that this is something to consider, as with the goal of affordable housing, there are challenges present with infrastructure and other factors, and that to avoid paying for it all out of pocket, these are great opportunities for getting outside money to come in.

Mr. Keller asked if the commissioners had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson said that the speaker from Mosby Mountain showed some images using the telephone pole and recalled that Mr. Franco had also shown some images. He asked Mr. Franco if he could compare while either reaching the same conclusions or different conclusions.

Mr. Franco said that they are reaching the same conclusion that the pole, being 35 feet tall, would result in potentially seeing 15 feet of the building. He said that it is difficult to describe because it depends on where one is standing there and noted that there is the stepback. Mr. Franco said that they have been able to get a picture from the road and then draw it up, and that the intersection has been more difficult. He reminded the Commission of the offer to put Mosby Mountain residents on the ARB as a member of the ARB as they will see the building.

Mr. Franco said that berming it would be difficult in maintaining the pedestrian trails and that it wouldn't add much value other than adjacent to the building in the beginning. He said that after that, existing trees would be disturbed and that trees in the buffer that are 65 to 75 feet in height would potentially be removed, and that he would hate to remove these trees just to create a berm and plant trees on top.

Mr. Dotson said that he wanted to understand the building setbacks from the diagram presented. He asked about the black dashed line, wondering if the trail was inside or outside of the line.

Mr. Franco replied that the black dashed line is the property line and that the trail is located on the inside of the line.

Mr. Dotson said that this was 30 feet and, as he read the code of development, asked if the minimum building setback would be an additional 20 feet.

Mr. Franco said that this is correct within Blocks 9, 10, 11, and 12, with the exception of the very first piece on Hickory Street. He said that the applicant is trying to allow the entrance to be seen

for the first 120 to 130 feet to allow just this portion of the buildings to be seen, and that the setback has been eliminated in this special zone.

Mr. Dotson said that upon reading the diagram (which he gathered was not necessarily a promise but a possibility), he wondered if the buildings would be set back even further than the parking.

Mr. Franco said that this is correct, and that pushing the buildings back further from the parking to reduce the height was part of the layout of changes made in the plan to date. He said that this is why the buildings are not visible past the main entrance on Hickory Street.

Mr. Dotson asked if this was a promise or a possibility.

Mr. Franco said that this was a possibility and it is the current plan, and that if there needed to be a way found to make this more of a promise, the applicant is open to doing this. He said that this could be done as a proffer as opposed to rewriting the code.

Ms. More mentioned that one of the speakers had comments about greenspace that goes along the stream, and then referenced the table of greenspace and amenity requirements by block. She said that she understands that there is concern about preserving the streams and there is ability to have trails located there. Ms. More asked if Mr. Franco could speak to the disturbance that could happen to supply utilities and what specifically is and isn't allowed in those spaces.

Mr. Franco said that at this point, Mr. Butler had correctly identified the uses that were allowed. He clarified that preservation was on top of the preserved slopes, and that conservation applies to the other items. Mr. Franco said that if development was to take place, there are some flat areas in the stream buffer areas that are semi-wooded or not wooded. He cited these flat areas as opportunities for additional play fields and the like, and that any disturbances there would require additional mitigation plans and that this is a normal process that is allowed.

Mr. Franco said that there are places that the designing resident planner identified there as potential ballfields or a farmer's market. He said that the main sewer that serves this area is in the flood plain of Biscuit Run and the perimeter streams. Mr. Franco said that they will have to go through the conservation areas and potentially the preservation areas to get to the sewer mains, and that this would have to occur in the future.

Ms. More said that she understands the flexibility and the way the greenspace wants to be programmed and acknowledged that one or more soccer fields may want to be put in but didn't see them on the drawing. She said that, while recognizing this is conceptual, she wanted to ensure that the early adopters who have put time into the process actualize themselves and where these fields, which are important to the community, would be located.

Mr. Franco replied that there is a possibility for mini soccer fields and that they would not all need to be full-sized. He said that one of the commitments made was, standing on the boulevards the first internal road and Hickory Street looking north at Block 12, a 6,500-square-foot area has been reserved there for community space and currently, it is being talked about as a mini soccer field area and a place for open play. Mr. Franco said that the others will be in Block 5 and that there is a significant amount of open space called for (about 4,500 square feet). He said that this could be done in chunks, but it is supposed to be done in chunks no smaller than 500 square feet. Mr. Franco said that they want to try to create some things that are not soccer fields so that there can

be other activities there. He said that the residents have the ability to program this in when they do the site plan and that they would be doing the site plan in Block 5. Mr. Franco said that the commitment will come as the code requires this space.

Mr. Franco presented an example of what the 6,500 square feet of community space would look like that includes a plaza. He indicated to a large building in Block 12 and to the right of it, the Block 11 neighborhood center. Mr. Franco said that the center will be bound on both sides of Hickory Street, with the open space at the intersection holding down one of the corners there.

Ms. More asked if this example was conceptual.

Mr. Franco replied that it is conceptual, but that within Block 12 it will be there. He said that it is described in the code of development for active use and noted that it is not completely fuzzy and must be there.

Ms. More asked if Blocks 8 through 12, are mixed-use areas (with the exception of the neighborhood center special area) or if they are specifically commercial.

Mr. Franco replied yes, that it is all mixed use and that primarily, the larger commercial (which is considered mixed use) will occur in the two large buildings, especially the one to the north, in Block 12. He said that the floor plate (14,000 square feet) is slightly bigger than the commitment for the incubator space (10,000 square feet). Mr. Franco said that this is primarily where residential would be seen, and that they wanted the height on the south side to provide for this opportunity in the future for those buildings but that primarily, this would be a residential building. He said that they wanted the entrances to be balanced, and the heights and characteristics of the building to be consistent on both sides.

Ms. More clarified that the intent of her question was to ensure that in the areas that are the densest in nature, there are greenspaces. She said that in Blocks 9 through 11, she could only see tiny green strips, though there has been importance stressed on having greenspaces. Ms. More said that it is nice, especially with younger kids in the area, for them to come right out and have greenspaces by the buildings and that she wished she could see more of this. She said that she understands this is only a concept, however, and that this was more of a comment rather than a question to elaborate on.

Ms. Firehock said that the report is very thorough, and she wanted to ask about the rehousing options. She said that Attachment F "Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan" refers to the promise of non-displacement for all residents of the 341 homes that participated in the registration process, and finding facilitated, healthy rehousing options. Ms. Firehock asked if she was correct in reading that Habitat would be doing everything it could to find something the residents could afford to live in, but that they could not actually promise to find them a house but only to provide those opportunities.

Mr. Franco said that it is more complicated than this, and that it is spelled out in more detail in the performance agreement with the Board of Supervisors. He said that the commitment is to rehouse people, and where it gets confusing is that it is difficult to explain how it will all occur because the plan has not yet been developed, and Phase I is in green fields. Mr. Franco added that, when looking at the project in total, it is a 12 to 15-year project and during this time period, there will be financial coaching with the residents there to help prepare them to leave their current trailers and

be able to ideally either purchase a Habitat home or go up to market rate. He said that it would be individualized, and that there is a requirement at the federal level with some of the federal money coming in that there will be a plan when the project comes to the phase where this will be spelled out on a resident by resident basis.

Mr. Keller said that staff was present to clarify.

Ms. Firehock said that she did read this agreement with the board and asked staff to clarify. She said that the understanding given to her by county staff was that currently, the rehousing plan applies only to the next phase, and doesn't apply to all the 341 homes. Ms. Firehock said that it talks about the residents only affected by the first phase.

Ms. Stacey Pethia, housing planner for the county, said that it is unclear at this time if any residents will be impacted by the infrastructure work, though the plan is not to have anyone move. She said that the infrastructure work in Phase I is being funded with a federal community block grant, and that this money requires a relocation plan for anyone who may be impacted.

Ms. Firehock asked if this meant anyone who would be displaced by the construction.

Ms. Pethia said that this is correct, and that she has spoken to Habitat, who is currently working through this. She said that this plan will need to be submitted to DHCD by October 31 for approval. Ms. Pethia said that she would be meeting with Habitat in the following week to read through the first draft. She said that there would need to be a relocation for each and every family that may be impacted by the work. Ms. Pethia said that any federal dollars that come through in future phases will require the same thing, and this first phase is where Habitat gets the plan down pat. She said that speaking with Habitat, they understand there will need to be, through the performance agreement, a relocation plan for every family moving forward. Ms. Pethia said that these plans were coming, but that they were not ready at the moment.

Ms. Firehock said that she understands this but as she is reading it, it only seems to refer to the potential homes on the edge.

Ms. Pethia said that this is correct.

Ms. Firehock said that there are 11 potential homes.

Ms. Pethia said that this is potential.

Ms. Firehock said that it is confusing for everyone that while there is talk about housing relocation assistance, coaching, and facilitation, there is no guarantee that the residents of all 341 homes would be relocated. She said that she has another question for the applicant in terms of a clause dealing with the development being a changing one, and that residents moving in understand what they're getting. Ms. Firehock said that the clause states that "anyone purchasing a trailer after January 31, 2014 has been notified that they have moved into...after the initiation of redevelopment, will not be guaranteed facilitated rehousing in the future." She asked if this scenario applies to a few households and wondered how many people this affects.

Mr. Dan Rosensweig, President and CEO of Habitat, said that this has changed, because the deeper understanding of federal requirements is that even people who have come since that time

will be promised the exact same thing as the people who have been there for longer. He said that future phases will be subject to exactly the same federal requirements as the ones they are subject to in Phase I. Mr. Rosensweig said that there will be a family by family plan consisting of a checklist of about 25 items that guarantees people will be rehoused. He said that their plan is to provide opportunities for people on site, though residents cannot be forced to if they do not want to.

Ms. Firehock agreed and said that she understood.

Mr. Bivins asked to view the envisioned plan again. He indicated to an area that is presently the neighborhood center special where he assumed that on one side, there will be an apartment or high-rise building, and that on the right-hand side, there would be office space.

Mr. Franco asked for clarification as to which area Mr. Bivins was referring to.

Mr. Bivins said that he was specifically looking at the salmon color, or the line that the plan identifies as "Neighborhood Center Special," and asked if there was an expectation that the same height of four stories and 50 feet, along with the setbacks, would run all the way down to this area.

Mr. Franco said that he didn't think the expectation was that this would occur, but that they wanted to make a provision for it to occur if that is what the residents wanted to have happen. He said that it makes sense to have that intersection framed consistently, and that in all likelihood, it would be more residential than it would be non-residential. Mr. Franco indicated to a block that would likely end up with a LIHTC and being set aside for two years for LIHTC. He said that it could move over into that piece as well to give it the density and unit count it needs to be successful, and that the height requirement would be there to not necessarily accommodate non-residential, but to accommodate the LIHTC.

Mr. Bivins asked if when Mr. Franco said that "move over," if this meant "expands," and if the multi-unit building that appears on the concept plan would not be moved below.

Mr. Franco said that they are not talking about relocating the buildings but extending the programming south.

Mr. Bivins asked if this meant there would be additional multi-family housing.

Mr. Franco said that it meant there would be taller multi-family housing.

Mr. Bivins said that when Mr. Franco spoke earlier about the buildings facing on Road 1A as opposed to entering them from Old Lynchburg Road, and then looking at the plan on page 13 of 21 of the code of development which names the "Neighborhood Center Special," it refers to straight-facing building length. He asked if this was referring to Hickory Street or to Road 1A.

Mr. Franco said that this refers to Hickory Street.

Mr. Bivins said that going back up to the front setback, if this was referring to Hickory Street or to Old Lynchburg Road.

Mr. Franco replied that Old Lynchburg Road comes in from five blocks down and indicated to a

long block with text in it, which says, “Zero minimum, no max.” He said that this is the trail buffer setback. Mr. Franco said that throughout the rest of the blocks (9 through 12), there is an additional 20 feet from the property that occurs, but in the trail buffer setback, it is the 30-foot minimum depth, or width, of Block 2.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification about the “front setback” and what street this is referring to.

Mr. Franco said that it is a front setback from Hickory Street.

Mr. Bivins asked if Hickory Street is serving as a “front door,” even though one is coming in on Road 1A.

Mr. Franco said that yes, that it is relegated parking and the front door will face onto Hickory Street, with minimal parking located on Hickory Street. He said that both of the parking areas are internal to the block and that there will be entrances and the main entry will be internal to Blocks 11 and 12, with front doors opening up to the Hickory Street direction. Mr. Franco added that this will give it a street presence, as it is Neighborhood Model.

Mr. Bivins said that he understood and that he would later address another point.

Mr. Dotson said that he wanted to clarify an earlier statement about Block 5 being the first village development. He said that if he understood in terms of the open and active space, there were concerns about where this was to be provided and that there isn’t a site plan yet that gets specific on it, but that there would be an opportunity to work with the community to better develop and define those amenities. Mr. Dotson said that currently, there is simply square footage allocated.

He asked Mr. Franco to talk about the process by which the applicant will work with the community and how the spaces will develop. Mr. Dotson said that the only places he could see the active spaces are by Block 12, which several blocks away from the development and that traffic would be moving through it. He said that it would hopefully grow to be a busy intersection with future development, and he wondered about the strategy of placing that active activity (such as ball fields) in a potentially unsafe area and what the logic was as to placing those fields there rather than closer to Block 5.

Mr. Franco replied that Block 5 will have its own requirements in regard to active spaces.

Mr. Dotson said that part of his question was about the process and how the community engages in identifying those opportunities, and if they are aware.

Mr. Franco said that if approved, they will be aware as this is part of the code of development. He said that there will be a requirement at site plan level to provide about 4,500 square feet in that block or area. Mr. Franco said that this would be one of the constraints given to the resident design team and the designers working with them of how to program this and where to put it within the community. He said that they will be told up front that they will need to provide that certain amount of space.

Mr. Dotson said that he didn’t see anything in that block that was dedicated as “Active.” He said that there are setback and greenspace and wondered if the 4,500 square feet was inclusive of those setbacks, which are needed anyway, and how much of that could actually be active.

Mr. Bruce Wardell, part of the design team, said that on page 15 of the code of development, there is a 7.0 greenspace and amenity requirements by block. He indicated to the various blocks on the left side and coming down are the various allowances that have been made as minimum recreational amenities and civic space for each of those areas. Mr. Wardell said that specifically for Block 5, there is 500 square feet of a neighborhood park.

Mr. Franco said that specifically, it's a matter of looking at the bigger development that is being developed as a site plan. He said that this is how the rules are applied and if they did nothing in that space in terms of active space, they would be subject to providing a certain amount of space by section for 4-16. Mr. Franco said that they have requirements for how much space will be there, and that the plan has been broadened out to say that in Blocks 5 through 7, there will be 500 square foot; 2,000 square foot; and 1,300 linear feet of trail.

Mr. Dotson asked if this was within Block 5 and if they were combining multiple blocks to get to the 4,500 square feet.

Mr. Franco replied yes and said that one of the reasons to do this is to potentially pick an outside block (such as Block 7) and choose to consolidate the block and put the ballfield there as a central amenity instead of internal to Block 5. He said that either way, it will end up close and accessible as all of Block 5 will be usable and engaged by the entire community.

Mr. Dotson said that 500 square feet would be located in the indicated area.

Mr. Franco replied no and said that Blocks 5 through 8 should be read together. He said that this is something that needs to be clarified on the plan.

Mr. Dotson said that this was his point, that he reads it as 500 square feet. He asked if Block 5 is being developed as the initial block, how do community members know they have an opportunity of 4,500 square feet, explaining that if they put 4,500 square feet in Block 5, they would not be able to achieve the density of housing there.

Mr. Franco said that some of the density would flow out into other parcels.

Mr. Dotson confirmed this and asked if there isn't an intent to develop them at the same time.

Mr. Franco said that this is what he was trying to say, and that he would explain in a different way. He said that Blocks V through VIII would come in as a single plan, whether that is a subdivision or a single site plan.

Mr. Dotson asked to verify if this would include Blocks 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. Franco said that this is correct, and that he sees Blocks 1, 3, and 4 coming in as subdivision or site plan. He said that these groups of blocks can be seen as spacing and for the front pieces, it will likely be Blocks 2, 9, 10, and 11 coming in at one time, and Block 12 as a separate submittal. Mr. Franco said that this would total four submittals when they get to the technical plans and that this has been banded across so that there will be a certain amount of square footage in each band. He said that this would ensure it is all within the areas usable for the residents and close by.

Mr. Dotson asked county staff if this was their understanding of how the site plan would be reviewed.

Ms. Nedostup said that this is correct, and as a point of reference, she had gone into the GIS and measured the existing informal soccer field, which is about 500 square feet.

Mr. Dotson thanked Mr. Franco and said that these are important things to clarify as the project moves forward in the site plan submission, adding that there are opportunities to create meaningful active spaces for a large community.

Mr. Wardell said that he wanted to answer a previous question that had been asked about how the residents will be involved in the site planning. He said that there has been a series of workshops set up over the next 2.5 to 3 months through which the residents who have identified themselves as being interested and committed to being in the first develop will participate in the workshops as the project goes through the site planning. Mr. Wardell said that these workshops would identify housing typologies, parking strategies, open space strategies, trails, and sidewalks. He said that the residents, along with the civil engineer and design team, will be working together over the next 8 to 10 weeks.

Mr. Wardell said that regarding the existing soccer field being very small, it was designed, built, and managed by the residents and is an intensely used space. Mr. Wardell said that this is the size of soccer field that is very easy for neighborhood pickup games and that a Darden Towe Park sized field is not needed in the neighborhood but rather, a smaller space for a few kids to kick a ball. He said that looking at the neighborhood center, the basketball courts are popular soccer fields. Mr. Wardell said that when discussing spaces in the neighborhood, there must be an understanding of the texture, scale, and size of the neighborhood when superimposing the ideas of how big the amenities ought to be, and that these are defined by the residents themselves.

Ms. Spain said that her colleagues have already addressed many of the concerns. She said that she taught Planning History for many years, and asked Mr. Rosensweig if he would speak to the Sunrise development, while acknowledging that the scale of the proposed project is much larger than Sunrise. Ms. Spain asked for information regarding the mix of Habitat homes, affordable homes, and market rate homes, and how Habitat proceeded to transform the mobile home park into what it is now in the city.

Mr. Rosensweig said that the strategy was fairly similar to what is being used with the Sunrise proposal, that there was an opportunity to move a couple trailers that could move across a hard edge (the existing road) so that the trailer park stayed intact and functional while the other side was redeveloped. He said that the replacement housing was developed on the other side, as were new Habitat family homes and market rate housing. Mr. Rosensweig said that once that first phase was done, people were able to move to where they had been to the new phase, and then new affordable housing was created there. He said that the total units in Sunrise is about 70, and there is some flexibility and a baseline of affordable, with promised or proffered life estate to all of the people there. Mr. Rosensweig said that they promised a number of deeply affordable units and Habitat units, and there was also flexibility because they wanted to see how the neighborhood changed over time. He said that there have been five incidents of residents passing away where their units were sold as condos to Habitat partner families.

Ms. Spain asked if in this instance at Sunrise, they were keeping the affordable units affordable.

Mr. Rosensweig replied yes and said that they were extending the affordability period to 40 years, which had originally been proffered as 12 years.

Ms. Spain asked if this was the general plan for Southwood.

Mr. Rosensweig said that their hope is that while they cannot force anyone to purchase a home, they want to work with every resident and give them an opportunity to purchase a home for likely less than what they are paying now when factoring in pad rental, trailer rental or mortgage in some cases, and high utility costs. He said that for other residents, they will be looking into multiplicity of deeply affordable options and where this impacts the code of development is in the flexible use structure, which is a new definition for an ADU created in consultation with the county staff which during its lifecycle could be an affordable rental. Mr. Rosensweig said that presently at Southwood, there are multiple families in some of the trailers or multiple family units, and that this provides breathing room by creating an affordable accessory dwelling unit that will be income- and deed-restricted affordable for a minimum of 10 years if rented to a Southwood resident. He added that during the lifecycle of the building, it could also be a home occupation and is a flexible use structure that could change as the family's situation changes.

Ms. Spain asked how long the affordability of unit would be guaranteed.

Mr. Rosensweig said that in the performance agreement, this was stated as a minimum of 10 years, but that this can be set differently. He said that the desire is to sell the units at a deeply discounted and subsidized price to a Southwood family who would buy the main home (and also a flexible use structure), but in exchange for the subsidy they must agree to rent it on a deed-restricted, affordable basis to Southwood residents. Mr. Rosensweig said that there aren't many affordable housing options that work, and that most affordable housing options are LIHTC. He said that LIHTC is a program through the Treasury that tends to end up being affordable to people at about 80% of their median income (sometimes 60%). Mr. Rosensweig said that they did a survey of the residents and found that only three families will qualify for LIHTC properties, and so Habitat is committed to doing deeply affordable housing themselves. He said that's the reason for flexibility in housing typology throughout Block A, explaining that if smaller condo units are built, they will hold and rent some of those.

Ms. Riley said that the Commission appreciated the additional information provided in the June work session. She said that her major concern, and likely one of many of her colleagues, is if the community will be affordable for the residents that are there now. Ms. Riley asked how many will be able to afford to buy, how many will need to rent, and what is the true plan for making this possible for the residents. She said that it would be helpful for her to have more information, recalling that there were three data sets provided to the Commission about the families – one in 2013, which she thought should be disregarded as “not current;” one in 2019, which she asked for explanation on as far as to how the data was gathered and how statistically relevant it is; and a data set of the early adopters. Ms. Riley said that it seems that if at least the early adopters were characterized, she wondered what percentage of them would be able to afford a home versus how many will need rental housing. She asked out of the 75 home ownership units in Phase I, how many of them might be acquired by early adopters.

Mr. Rosensweig said that right now in the first model village, there are 31 families participating in the site planning process, and that 28 of these families intend to be homeowners. He said that based on the income verification collected so far as well as some self-reported information, Habitat believes that each of the 28 families can afford to be homeowners, which leaves three families. Mr. Rosensweig said that of the three remaining families, he was unsure as to how many were choosing to rent or how many cannot qualify.

Ms. Molly McCumber, Community Engagement Coordinator for the Southwood neighborhood, said that she has been involved in many of the financial appointments with families. She said that there are 31 families and of those families, 28 said that they are interested in buying and that based on the financial appointments, would qualify to buy were they to apply today. Ms. McCumber said that of the other three families, one is considering renting by choice, and two were renting in deeply affordable rentals because their incomes were not enough to purchase.

Mr. Rosensweig said that there are about 17 to 18 families of the 31 who intend to purchase at a typology that allows for a flexible use structure, and that this group would be met with to determine if there would be at least three interested in a building a flexible use structure that will provide rental housing for the other three families in the cohort. He said that if not, Habitat would likely build three rentals and rent them affordably simply because this is not the kind of scale that can be built or sold to a third party.

Ms. Riley said that originally, the Commission was told there were 52 families in the early adopter's group and asked if there were now 31.

Mr. Rosensweig replied no and said that there 92 families who have now stepped forward and requested to be part of the first phase. He said that in the performance agreement, there was a minimum of 75 Habitat units promised in the first phase, and that he was delighted there are 92 and that Habitat will have room to build for the people interested in the first phase. Mr. Rosensweig said that what people have been asked to do is identify themselves in smaller villages, essentially allowing them to choose their "teams" as to who they would like to plan with and live with in sub-neighborhoods. He said that the first group planning a sub-neighborhood consists of the 31 families, but that there are two more cohorts of approximately the same size who will do the same for Village 2 and Village 3 as part of the first phase.

Ms. Riley said that she was still challenged with trying to understand, looking at the data, why 72% of the families are below 50% of the AMI, and 51% are below 30%. She said that she was not under the impression that either by choice or by affordability, many of these families would be able to purchase and that ultimately, she questioned how rentals would be guaranteed in Phase I not just for early adopters, but for the bulk of families there who may not ever be able to afford to buy.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that Habitat subsidizes and sells homes to families below 30% of their median income. He said that 25% is the lowest they accept, and that some of the families in the early cohorts may be at 21.2% of their median income. Mr. Rosensweig said that Habitat's job in the next year or so is to work with these families one on one to bring them up to 25% so they meet the underwriting standards. He said that this is Habitat's subsidy and that they raise their subsidy. Mr. Rosensweig said that Habitat is the provider in the area that provides the deepest affordability other than public housing and Friendship Court.

Ms. Riley said that she was trying to receive acknowledgment that there would be a percentage of families who would rent, either by choice or by necessity. She asked what the number of families or percentage would be.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that the percentage of the first group is 3 out of 31.

Ms. Riley said that she meant overall out of the 341 families because ultimately, she recognizes that the rezoning is about Phase I and that they are only responsible through the CDBG funding to be accountable for the relocation of the families in Phase I, but that for the Commission, this is the beginning of a long-term process where they don't want to see any of the families displaced, as Habitat doesn't want to either. Ms. Riley said that the Commission is looking at the long-term plan of the actual rehousing needs for these families and if the outparcel is sold to an outside developer that is responsible for the Low Income Housing Tax Credit units that would house the lowest income families that need rentals, how Habitat would be held accountable for this or how the Commission would know that this would come to fruition.

Mr. Rosensweig said that the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit was largely in deference to the county's and the Commission's request to look for creative ways to get more below 80% of area median income housing in the first phase. He said that they discounted Block 12 and have an agreement with the builder, and an agreement that flows through the performance agreement to only sell Block 12 to a LIHTC developer for two years. Mr. Rosensweig said that they discounted the land and will build 80 LIHTC units on Block 12 as well as provide a minimum of five years of rent-free commercial space for business incubation so that the "downtown" neighborhood center would be for businesses owned by Southwood residents. He said that to be clear, this is to provide more affordable housing to suit the regional need and is not intended for Southwood families. Mr. Rosensweig said that only three Southwood families qualified for this. He said that the affordable component will be built through the flexible use structure or by creating rental apartments as part of the buildout as to suit the needs and desires of the residents of Southwood.

Ms. Riley asked if three of the 31 families would be the only families to qualify for that housing, or if there would be additional families that would qualify once extrapolating this across the 341 total families there.

Mr. Rosensweig replied no and apologized for not being clear. He said that three families that currently live at Southwood would qualify for LIHTC rentals. Mr. Rosensweig said that there are three families of the 31 families that are part of the first village that either want or can only qualify for rentals. He said that 28 of the 31 families that are in the process right now of designing the first neighborhood will qualify to purchase. Mr. Rosensweig said that if being asked to extrapolate this, all he has are a couple of data points, and that these could be extrapolated to say maybe 9 or 10 in the first phase will be rentals. He said that Habitat would like to see this happen through the flexible use structure, though they cannot force another Habitat family to buy a home and also rent a flexible use structure. Mr. Rosensweig said that if 9 families choose not to do this, Habitat will build rental apartments and rent them affordably.

Ms. McCumber said that long term, it is difficult to know this data because families are trying to decide what they can afford and what they need. She said that many people in Southwood don't necessarily know where they will be, especially the ones not in the first phase. Ms. McCumber said that folks outside of Phase I want to see what happens first to give them a better idea of what they can plan for their families. She said that in terms of collecting the financial data, Habitat will

be working with each family on their financial situation, noting that each family is very different. Ms. McCumber said that many people who need deeply affordable units are in different types of situations – some are seniors, some are families – and that there isn't one single solution that will fit for everyone. She said that this is why flexibility is desired in working with the families, to ensure that Habitat is giving them something that they want as opposed to something Habitat decides they will fit into.

Ms. Riley said that this was very helpful, and that this is the first time she has understood that the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit project talked about in the special area was not intended for the residents and that it would be serving other families. She said that this is good clarification and is appreciated.

Mr. Keller asked if there were any other questions for the applicant before closing the public hearing. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and announced there would be a five-minute break.

After the break, the meeting resumed. Mr. Keller said that if staff speaks to the applicant for details, this will be the process rather than the Commission having a dialogue with the applicant.

Mr. Dotson had a comment and additional information about something stated in the staff report, under Factors Unfavorable. He said that the statement about Cale Elementary is true, but there is more to it than what is in the report, and he wanted to provide additional information for better understanding. Mr. Dotson said that as the report is written, it says, "The rezoning request will add additional students to Cale Elementary, which is over capacity." He said that this is true, that it is over capacity by 13 students and that compared to some of the other county schools that are over capacity, this is a small to moderate amount. Mr. Dotson continued to read the staff report, which stated, "...for no plans for expansion for additional students." He said that in one sense this is true, and in another it is not.

Mr. Dotson said that the reason he knows this is because he also serves on the County School Division Long Range Planning Advisory Committee and that on July 11, the committee made their report and recommendations to the Board of Education. Mr. Dotson said that in regard to the plans for the school, the report said that, "...Cale expansion and site improvements." He said that the issue is how the word "expansion" can be interpreted. Mr. Dotson the proposal said that, "The project funds expansion and site improvements to support the current student population at Cale Elementary. The project expands the cafeteria" (which Mr. Dotson noted is a major problem at Cale and the committee spend a lot of time discussing) "and adds four classrooms, a music and art classroom, for a total of 8,800 square feet. Site improvements include additional parking and enhanced outdoor learning spaces and playgrounds, and removal of the mobile units" (which Mr. Dotson noted would be 4 units). He said that these are the plans recommended to the Board of Education and that among other recommended projects, this one ranks 6 out of 10 and would cost \$5.4 million. Mr. Dotson noted that while there are plans, they are not funded. He said in August, the Board of Education is meeting to decide its priorities and knows that Cale has problems. Mr. Dotson suggested that people who are concerned about the overcapacity at Cale should turn out to that meeting in much of the same way they did at the present meeting to voice their concerns.

Mr. Dotson added that Cale is the second largest elementary school in the county, and the Board of Education has opinions about what is too large for an elementary school, which Cale is nearing

to in size. He said that the site is nearly maxed out, and there isn't room to add significantly to it. Mr. Dotson said that the idea, longer term, is to study alternatives, perhaps a new school. He said that county land is located not far from there that people are considering for different uses. Mr. Dotson said that there is also a study being done about the middle schools, and Walton is particular because if it had three grades and the upper grades from Cale were transferred there, this would just about solve the needs. He said that recommended is a study of all the middle schools, which may become part of the Cale solution in a somewhat longer term. Mr. Dotson said that while there are no plans for expansion in the near future, there are plans for addressing that unfavorable factor.

Ms. More said that she has been back and forth about making the unfavorable factors and appreciated Mr. Dotson's clarification. She said that existing traffic concerns in the area (number 7 on the list of priorities in transportation) and that one of the first speakers said that the county is asking to have this growth and density, and that staff has to acknowledge what is happening with the schools and infrastructure. Ms. More said that she understands they have to acknowledge this. She said that she is very impressed with everything that has gone into the project and the time dedicated to it and is sure they will be a part of how the project moves forward.

Ms. More said that every staff report the Commission receives is put up against the Comprehensive Plan and they check off the boxes to see if the goals are met. She said that what is being seen more and more is that there are infrastructure issues, and that her comments are not specific to the Southwood proposal but that more generally speaking, while she isn't suggesting that developers should pay for the burden, what is being seen is the impact of the collective when the Commission approves rezoning. Ms. More said that there are goals highlighted in the same Comprehensive Plan that says the county wants the growth but also promises continued funding of capital improvements and infrastructure and provide a higher level of service to the development area. She said that she believes the county is falling behind in this and that while she doesn't have a solution, it must become part of the greater conversation, moving forward.

Ms. More said that it needs to be a discussion between the Commission and the board, the reporting with schools, and with long-range transportation. She said that these are concerns that, when the county decided to have the growth management policy (which she believes in), people were concerned many years ago that keeping up infrastructure would be a problem. Ms. More said that it's not a matter of whether a development creates more traffic on a road, but that the county needs to come together about infrastructure (much in the way they are discussing how to handle the affordable housing policy) and determine how to move forward. She said that many of the people living in these areas have intersections that do not function properly, and that she wasn't suggesting this had anything to do with Southwood. Ms. More said that she thinks Southwood's plan is solid, but the unfavorable factors indicate that the county needs to get ahead of the problem, as she feels they are beginning to drown in it.

Ms. Firehock said that she wrote out some comments during the meeting, which clarified she did not prepare ahead of time and that she did listen to everyone who spoke. She said that she would quickly read through the different points.

Ms. Firehock read her comments, which said that, "Affordable Housing has been used as the rationale for the dense development being proposed along Old Lynchburg Road. The argument made by Habitat for Humanity is that they need to maximize revenue for development on the

remainder of the site. The community is 341 households of which 75 will possibly have a home in the first development section. This is only a fraction of those displaced. Habitat for Humanity (HABITAT) in their described plan will 'facilitate' others finding housing but does not guarantee it.

"A review of Attachment E shows that 80 percent of randomly sampled residents have income that is less than 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Of that 80 percent, 51% have income less than 30% of the AMI. The arguments that these residents can afford the offered prices for homeownership are not believable to me.

"80 affordable apartments are proposed, but not guaranteed, and rely on federal tax credits being offered twice by the federal government to a third party that is not HABITAT. This is not proffered and is thus unenforceable. It is also not promised to be offered to current Southwood Residents as stated during tonight's public hearing.

"While this plan provides some affordable housing – the 'early adopters' appear to have a somewhat better income level, leading to my concern that they may represent the exception rather than being a likely representative sample of what can occur with the remainder of the project.

"The performance agreement refers only to the first phase of development. At best, 155 affordable units are provided, but I am unsure of the ability to provide for ALL the households of Southwood.

"Regarding the Neighborhood Center, the very large commercial structures along Old Lynchburg Road are too large, in my opinion. The Comp Plan calls for a 'neighborhood center.' That's true, but it also says the center should be ¼ mile from the edge and that it truly should be located in the center. The commercial structures are on the edge of the development, and the massing is not at a scale intended to serve the neighborhood. The recommended height in the Comp Plan is 1-3 stories. It does say that other exceptions could be made. I stated in the work session that I thought that no greater than two stories was appropriate for a rural character, largely residential road south of town.

"Regarding roads and traffic, the county has already stated that the Old Lynchburg Road's traffic is already failing. Adding this level of commercial development and density with no funding for traffic improvements is unsustainable." This goes in line with Ms. More's comments.

"Regarding the buffer and character, the Comp Plan recommends a buffer be along the road; however, the 4 or 5 story building is placed in the buffer and destroys it for blocks 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 because it simply isn't wide enough.

"In addition, when a forest is removed and thinned down to the width proposed, trees tend to fall as they are not adapted to wind impacts and will likely fall. In other words, they have grown up in a forest and are not strong enough. Working with Departments of Forestry, they will not recommend you have such a skinny buffer. Many of the trees, if not all, would likely have to be removed.

"Trees shown in renderings, if planted, will take 70 years to provide the same function for screening, stormwater uptake, particulate matter removal and aesthetics. In other words, we saw beautiful drawings of what the future might look like, but that will take a long time to achieve.

"The surrounding neighborhoods have a distinct rural character set back from the road, and this

development design dramatically changes both the density and character of this area irreparably.

“Regarding parking, parking of 1.5 spaces per residents is inadequate in a suburban development -- perhaps for a downtown, but not for this location.

“Regarding stormwater management, the plan states it will discharge volume to streams and buy ‘off site’ credits as allowed by state law. However, unfortunately this means that the quality of local streams will decline – only one section of stream has been protected and could still suffer from high volumes of runoff, since it is not protected from volume.

“Regarding recreation, amenities are too vague, insufficient and non-committal. 4,900 square feet distributed across Blocks 5-8 (even with 500 square foot minimums) is still too small. Tot lots, structured recreation and facilities are needed for a development of this scale. Blocks 1 and 2 are drawn as green space but allow for other uses to occur, which may disturb it.”

Ms. Firehock said that these were the highlights of her concerns with the Southwood development. She said that she was very supportive of affordable housing, despite what one may think, and that she has spent her career working on it. Ms. Firehock said that the bottom line is that she doesn’t believe this level of commercial development along Old Lynchburg Road is appropriate for that area and that while she supports the development of affordable housing, she does not support this level of commercial scale development in order to achieve it.

Mr. Bivins asked staff to walk him through a few things, as he was still puzzled as to who is developing what. He said that he understands that Habitat is taking the lead on Block 5, but he needed explanation as to who is developing Blocks 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 and if it would be easily financially accessible or if it would be market rate housing.

Ms. Nedostup said that staff doesn’t have this information and would have to defer to the applicant to answer those questions, as they were not part of staff’s review of the code of development on who ultimately would be building.

Mr. Franco said that Habitat are the developers of the project and would be putting in the infrastructure. He said that Blocks 9, 10, 11, and 12 would be sold as an outparcel to a builder who will develop market-rate apartments and multi-family units such as duplexes.

Mr. Bivins asked about Block 8.

Mr. Franco said that everything else is being built by Habitat. He said that there may be some affordable units built in Blocks 3 and 4, but the lots within them would be sold to either a builder or to individuals who buy the lots to build houses on.

Mr. Bivins asked if the individual could or could not meet the AMI.

Mr. Franco said that this was correct, and that the goal was not to make the development 100% affordable, but to have a mixture of incomes.

Mr. Bivins said that looking at the proposed area on the plan that says, “Future Phases of Development,” he assumed that the area labeled “Conceptual Location of Phase II” would be considered a Habitat area, and if this assumption was correct.

Ms. Nedostup replied yes and said that this parcel is owned by Habitat.

Mr. Bivins asked if this parcel would eventually become an affordable neighborhood.

Ms. Nedostup prefaced by saying she would ask the applicant for clarification but said that her understanding was that when this phase comes in, the plan would follow the colors and intensities and typologies of housing that is shown in the first phase that is currently under review. She said that, for example, the yellow area would continue into the yellow area with the same type of housing typology.

Mr. Bivins asked about the cream-colored area on the plan.

Ms. Nedostup said that this typology would continue into the Phase II typology.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Nedostup to zoom in on the peak area and go to the right or left of it and asked what these areas would become in terms of density.

Ms. Nedostup indicated to an area and said that it has been washed out to identify a future phase of development. She said that they are the same colors, but more washed out to signify future phases. Ms. Nedostup said that this was her understanding and that she would ask the applicant to confirm this.

Mr. Franco said that this is correct and reiterated that Habitat would be the developer of the entire project. He said that they envision that the majority of the lighter color perimeter lots on the plan would be market rate, and that the majority of the blocks that have color to them will be villages with the typologies represented in Phase I drifting in that direction. Mr. Franco said that while it is general in concept, the entire project is a Habitat project.

Mr. Bivins asked who the owner of the heavy vegetation areas would be.

Mr. Franco said that community would own this.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification.

Mr. Franco said that there would be an HOA and that it would be no different than Forest Lakes or Glenmore. He said that it would have a homeowner's association that would be open space, with trails that would be maintained by the association or potentially by the public (depending on where it is). Mr. Franco said that it would be open space.

Mr. Bivins said that the emerging Southwood HOA would be the owner there.

Mr. Franco said that this is correct.

Mr. Bivins said that over the last few days, he drove around the county to try to see the entrances to residential areas. He cited Forest Lakes, Hollymead, Crozet, and 250 past Glenmore to determine if he could find any places with a four-story building. Mr. Bivins said that the center area of the Southwood redevelopment is one that may be slated for four-story structures and 50,000 square feet. He said that there would be a canyon entry of four-story buildings with each

one being about 20,000 square feet, which is a lot.

Mr. Bivins said that driving around the county, he couldn't find one four-story building except for in office parks. He said that he even went to the University, around Fontaine Avenue, and also didn't find any four-story buildings and that though there were three-story buildings and some at 60,000 square feet, there was nothing like what is being described in the proposal. Mr. Bivins said that he struggles with this, because he is very concerned that there is a segregation of people on subsidized housing if the canyon is brought down to Bitternut, and the rest of the property would be low density. He said that he has issue with the four stories, and with what might be a commercial canyon coming down to Bitternut.

Mr. Bivins said that he loved the rest of the project, but expressed his disappointment that the project would have low density that would be sold to people who would then develop whatever they wish there, and that the only remaining area for people who would perhaps be the original residents would be Block B. He said that while the housing plan for Block B is beautiful, the rest of the project is seen at market rates, and Block B is also segregated by putting in four-story, 20,000-square-foot buildings there with parking in the back of them. Mr. Bivins said that if this could be explained to him, he may move, but he currently felt as though the hardworking people of Southwood will eventually be put on an island surrounding by low-density, expensive market rate housing. He said that this is what the plan looked like to him, particularly when he learned about the center.

Ms. Nedostup asked for clarification about the affordable housing and the mixture of incomes.

Mr. Wardell said that he would clarify, as he has been working with the residents for years. He said that he wanted to address three or four things.

Mr. Wardell said that regarding the color scheme and overall plan, the density of color general reflects the density of development. He said that there is a high-density color along Hickory and is the densest part of the neighborhood. Mr. Wardell said that moving down towards the ochre color of Block 5, that area is less dense. He said that regarding Block 5 coming into Phase II, which would be the Bitternut neighborhood, one can see the extension of the texture in that development.

Mr. Wardell said that while generally, the perimeter lots are designated as market-rate lots, this is not a rule. He said that when they begin to develop the site plan, they want to understand how the affordable units will cross that street. Mr. Wardell said that it is mixed income and is not separated incomes (as in all of the market rates around the edge, and all of the affordable in the middle). He said that this is not the way it will develop and is not the way the residents have developed it. Mr. Wardell said that generally, all the lots are similar typologies, so they may be a mix of single-family residences and attached units. He said that those attached units could be affordable, but they would be on the typology of lot around the perimeter. Mr. Wardell said that while he sees why Mr. Bivins was developing a description of a segregated, segmented community, that this was not at all what is intended to be.

Mr. Wardell said that there may be a misunderstanding, that the proposed building on the northside of Hickory Street is not a 40,000 or 50,000 square foot office building. He explained that the ground floor is where the subsidized commercial units would be located, and that three stories of housing would be located on top of it. Mr. Wardell said that on the south side of Hickory Street,

the same building typology would be present where the top three floors would be residential, and the ground floor would be common space opening out onto the street. He said that this would allow for future commercial development on the first floor.

Mr. Bivins asked if on the south side of the subject area, there would be apartments on the top three floors.

Ms. Nedostup said that this was her understanding.

Mr. Wardell said that yes.

Mr. Bivins asked if there would only be one floor of commercial.

Mr. Wardell and Ms. Nedostup said that yes.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was no other commercial in the park.

Mr. Wardell said that currently, reading the code of development, there is opportunity for small-scale commercial within Blocks 5, 6, and 7. He said that the entrance off of Old Lynchburg Road is the entry to the neighborhood, and obviously it would be the largest scale of the neighborhood. Mr. Wardell said that the idea of having it in the middle of the neighborhood reduces it.

Mr. Bivins said that putting it in the middle was not his issue. He said that his issue was whether there would be a commercial building on the south side of Hickory Street.

Mr. Wardell said that it is one level of commercial with three levels of residential over it. He said that it is less than 50 feet tall, at about 46 feet tall.

Mr. Bivins said that this was helpful to know that it is not all office. He said that the other thing he was concerned about is isolation and segregation, and that the project does not result in default segregation. Mr. Bivins asked if the Commission could expect that there would be mixed use and mixed income throughout the rest of the phases and not just segregated in the one space.

Mr. Wardell said that this was correct. He added that in the code of development, the permitted uses in the various districts allows for this.

Mr. Bivins said that while he appreciates the work that has been done, there are still a number of pieces in the code of development that leaves the imagination to run and that there are still pieces to nail down. He said that if there will be default segregation, he will be confused.

Mr. Wardell said that hopefully, he made it clear that the code of development does not encourage this.

Mr. Bivins said that he has known Mr. Wardell and he does good work in the community, and that he trusts his opinion if there is no dissent from the team.

Mr. Wardell said that working with the residents over the last 2.5 years, they have developed a culture that wouldn't allow the default segregation to happen.

Mr. Bivins said that there are a few places in Charlottesville where culture has been put on the backburner for money. He said that he appreciates the fact that the citizens of Southwood are engaged and energetic and that he can see a bright future. Mr. Bivins said that he is also aware that money talks and when projects are trying to get finished, money talks in a way that those who have been fully engaged have their voices minimized. He said that Mr. Wardell is saying that would not happen.

Mr. Wardell said that the residents have been involved in the money conversations about the sale of the parcels. He said that this has not been a third-party isolated process but has been a discussion that has happened among the residents and people they have been planning with. Mr. Wardell said that the residents understand the necessity of selling property in order to subsidize the affordability of the neighborhood.

Mr. Bivins said that Mr. Wardell's words made him feel much better about the matter.

Ms. Spain said that she wasn't sure if it merits full disclosure, but she has been a volunteer at the Habitat Store for 10 years and has worked with Habitat families in the past, and thus is a big supporter of their mission. She reminded her colleagues that when they considered small development at Belvedere at the intersection of Rio Road and Belvedere, traffic was called out as a significant problem, and residents pointed out the number of accidents. Ms. Spain said that yet, that proposal went forward with a majority vote and was recommended to the Board of Supervisors. She said that traffic, as Ms. More stated earlier and as the commissioners all agree, is the weak link in all of the plans. Ms. Spain said that the Commission does continue to try to acknowledge it is a problem.

Ms. Spain said that she also thinks that this is such an ambitious, non-traditional project that the Commission cannot apply all the types of criteria that they might to a more traditional development. She said that she does share concerns with her colleagues, but she sees the building heights or canyons as things that can still be worked out. Ms. Spain said that she cannot imagine telling the residents, who have broken all sorts of barriers despite their shortage of time and resources, no. She said that her vote would be yes.

Ms. Riley said that she would agree with most of what her colleagues had said that. She said that she agrees with Ms. Spain that no one would want to say the project should not move forward. Ms. Riley said that the big question before the Commission is if it is ready to move forward now. She said that there were significant issues raised and a number that haven't been discussed. Ms. Riley said that as the commissioner for the district, and as a former affordable housing organizer and staff person for many community-based development organizations, her major concern is not to displace any of the families and that the redevelopment is made affordable for the residents who live there now, as well as future residents.

Ms. Riley said that there was also a concern from her about the actual, physical design of the project. She said that some of her colleagues had already mentioned that a future design where the center is located truly in the center, and that the community is walkable, would be preferred. Ms. Riley said that going beyond preference, staff has identified that there are aspects of the application that are consistent with the Southern West Master Plan and the Comp Plan. She said that there is a call for urban density residential development, and that she agrees that denser development needs to be done, as well as larger scale and massing.

Ms. Riley said that where this is located is the problem at this point with the proposal. She said that the center ought to be designed to serve the neighborhood needs and cited the master plan which calls for a neighborhood service center – not a commercial center, or a neighborhood special center. Ms. Riley said that she would argue that the location along Old Lynchburg Road does not meet the plan's definition of a center, given that it is located on the periphery of the Southwood community, and would not function as a neighborhood center serving the residents of Southwood since the vast majority of residents would have to walk further than ¼ mile to the center.

Ms. Riley said that she believes the massing and scale of the buildings along Old Lynchburg Road and in Blocks 8 through 12 are out of character with the existing uses and existing residential communities. She said that a more centrally-located neighborhood service center is more appropriate, and that page 61 of the master plan under the section "5<sup>th</sup> Street Extended Improvements," it states that "From the Southwood property south, to the development area boundary, retain the rural road section with vegetative buffers on both sides of Old Lynchburg Road." Ms. Riley said that with buildings at a height of 35 feet and 50 feet all along Old Lynchburg Road, it will be impossible to create that vegetative visual buffer and to retain the rural character of the area. She said that the commissioners must keep in mind that every precedent they establish then becomes the future possibility for all along Old Lynchburg Road, because then they could no longer argue that the old character is the new character. Ms. Riley said that this would become the character of the area, and that the master plan needs to be upheld in this case.

Mr. Keller said that he spent the last four decades documenting, evaluating, planning, and designing for communities, mostly communities he considers distinctive, cultural communities. He said that his first degree is in Anthropology, and his initial studies have informed his practice and teaching in landscape architecture. Mr. Keller said that he has not had the opportunity to immerse in the current Southwood community, but he suspects that if he had done so professionally or academically, he would find it to be a special community given its age, characteristics, design and layout, a blend of vernacular and cultural overlays on an intentional 20<sup>th</sup>-century mobile home community that some might even find possesses cultural resource significance.

Mr. Keller said that he had had some serious misgivings about the disruption of land, spatial organization, and the way of life that he understands to exist at Southwood. He said that at the same time, he also understands the local, regional, and national pressures to increase and upgrade housing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and to find new models for how and where redevelopment can occur in a thoughtful manner.

Mr. Keller said that he has heard some refer to this project as the "Vinegar Hill of our times." He said that he is hopeful that this project, which would disrupt a community, has been so carefully considered that it is only a fraction of the upheaval of Vinegar Hill, and that the outcomes will enhance – rather than destroy – family and community life, and the mixed-use scenarios will legitimize and provide better opportunities for successful entrepreneurship. Mr. Keller said that he understands there has been a substantial community process, and that this process has been undertaken locally and lauded by many in the community, including those who are professionals in this field.

Mr. Keller said that the elected officials have invested heavily in this project, and that the memorandum of agreement that Mr. Kamptner reviewed earlier reveals how much of a final commitment in both funding and staff that the county has made in this project. He said that

furthermore, the proposed update to the housing chapter of the Comp Plan that the Commission would discuss next would hopefully provide policy and an implementation plan for affordable housing throughout the county.

Mr. Keller said that Southwood is intended to be Albemarle's signature affordable housing and redevelopment project, and is intended to be a model but can only happen if evaluation and reevaluation is built into each stage of the project and if its creators, enablers, and residents will be bold and brave enough to know what is not working and intervene to keep it the visionary project it claims to be.

Mr. Keller said that for these reasons, with some reluctance and a great deal of hope, he supports the proposed rezoning. He said that he hopes that those involved could come together as a group to discuss mutual concerns and send this message to the supervisors.

Mr. Bivins said that he imagined the two documents before the Commission (the response letter, and the code of development) would go to the supervisors, depending on the outcome of the meeting.

Ms. Nedostup said that this is correct.

Mr. Bivins said that one of the things he is troubled with the fact that Habitat earlier said that the images, designs, maps, and schematics are only proposed, meaning that they could change in the future. He said that he is making decisions to support the project based on what he has been told and what exists in the documents, and that he will feel as if the rug has been pulled out from underneath his vote if, at a time further along, all the schematics, figures, and tables have a radical edit. Mr. Bivins said that he is trying to figure out a way where all the figures and tables could, in fact, become part of the record which is what the applicant is being held to.

Mr. Herrick stated that the code of development becomes part of the zoning, so if the project is approved by the Board of Supervisors, the code of development that gets approved would be an enforceable zoning document. He said that obviously there may be changes to the extent that either the Planning Commission recommends them, or the board chooses to discuss and adopt them, but those would only be approved by the board.

Mr. Bivins asked if the applicant could be held to the figures (for example, Figure 4).

Mr. Herrick said that he doesn't believe that the particular figure (Figure 4) is part of the code of development. He said that part of the reason is because what is before the Commission presently is only Phase I, the area outlined in the heavy bolded dashed line. He said that while he appreciates Mr. Bivins' concerns of what might be to come within the future phase development, that is not before the Commission presently. He said that this is only a rezoning application for Phase I, which is the area outlined.

Mr. Bivins asked if it was fair for him to assume that all the items illustrated for Phase I would be something that would go forward.

Mr. Herrick said that it was up to the Commission whether or not to recommend the code of development, but that the code of development (if approved) would become part of the zoning for the property.

Mr. Bivins said that with this in mind, if there is a way for the Commission to enforce this, he is inclined to support the request, although he does believe that the first few buildings around the entry would be better served as one story less than they are. He added that at this point, he wants the people of Southwood to remain fully engaged, strong advocates for themselves and their future in an environment where there may be pressures for them not to be.

Ms. Firehock said that she understands what has been said that about the code of development and the setbacks, but where the confusion lies is in the statements that the plans are illustrative only and not to be taken as literal site layouts, acknowledging that this is not a site layout but a rezoning to a certain use. She said that many things can be changed because the illustrations are not proffered, which has been stated clearly by the applicant.

Mr. Herrick said that as a Neighborhood Model District, part of the county code says a code of development “shall establish the unifying design guidelines, the specific regulations for the district, and the use characteristics for each block; provide for certainty in the location of and appearance of central features and the permitted uses in the district; and provide a flexible range of a mix of uses and densities.” He said that it goes on to specify what specific elements need to be in a code of development. Mr. Herrick reiterated that if a code of development is approved, it becomes part of the zoning of a property.

Ms. Firehock said that she understood this. She said that she would not reiterate her concerns with open space. Ms. Firehock said that she wants this to be a quality development and appreciates everyone attending to share their perspectives and thinks that Habitat has done a wonderful thing in supporting the current residents already with subsidized rents and taking care of maintenance issues at the site. She continued that Habitat has done a great job with engaging the residents and teaching them how to design.

Ms. Firehock said that she is still very concerned with the ability to rehouse all the residents of Southwood, at Southwood (not elsewhere in the county). She said that some of the concerns she has that people have scoffed at has to do with a great concern that people are not displaced.

Ms. Firehock expressed that she is not against having commercial development at the site and recalled from the last work session that she liked the idea of the small business incubators and training, and all the work that has been done around this. She said that she did not like the level of scale and massing that is on Old Lynchburg Road and still thinks this could be pulled back to be more internal and not so large.

Ms. Firehock said that she wants the residents to make money on the parcel so they can afford to do the things they want to do, but just thinks it goes a bit too far. She said that she would like to see a better design and acknowledged the fact that they are on a deadline with several federal funds to take advantage of. Ms. Firehock said that she feels as though the applicant needs to spend another six months on the design. She reiterated that she doesn't believe it is the right level of development on a rural character road.

Ms. More said that she didn't have much to elaborate and agreed with many points the other commissioners made. She said that she has some concerns about the height, but that what Ms. Spain said that was accurate in that there is something unique about the project and that it should be approached with that understanding. Ms. More said that she didn't feel as if the height of the

building Mr. Bivins had expressed concerns with was anything that would prevent her from wanting the project to move forward.

She said that there is the understanding that with greenspace, there is the need for flexibility and programming from the residents, but that there is concern that it is ambiguous in certain sections and could be further detailed. Ms. More said that she feels as if a big part of this is a leap of faith that she is personally willing to take. She said that she knows Mr. Wardell well enough to know that he would likely summarize some of the points made, and that she had been ready to make a motion.

Mr. Dotson expressed that the proposal was good, and that it contained elements of faith and acceptable risk due to the potential benefits. He said that if a commissioner were to move, he would second the motion.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of ZMA201800003 Southwood Phase 1 for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Dotson requested that the applicant address the question he asked earlier about the intersperse of the parking and setbacks of the building between now and going to the Board of Supervisors, and that those physical arrangements be made as a promise however they need to be accomplished.

The motion was carried by a vote of 6:1.

Mr. Keller thanked everyone for attending, as well as for their comments. He also thanked the applicant, and the staff members who worked for many hours on this.

Mr. Keller announced that there would be another five-minute break and encouraged attendees to stay if they were interested in the next related topic, which was affordable housing policy.

### **Regular Items**

#### **CPA201900003 Resolution of Intent to Amend the Comprehensive Plan – Housing Policy Update**

Mr. Keller asked for the staff report.

Ms. Stacey Pethia, housing planner for the county, said that her report would be short. She said that she did not have a presentation but would run through a summary.

Ms. Pethia said that the resolution of intent is to amend the comprehensive plan which, with the approval of the ROI, would allow staff to move forward by updating the current housing policy. She said that the housing policy was written initially in 2002, adopted in 2004, and had minor amendments in 2015 that were adopted into the Comp Plan as an appendix. Ms. Pethia said that after the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission released their regional housing report, staff felt it was a good time to take a comprehensive look at the housing policy and bring it more

up to date.

Ms. Pethia said that in the commissioners' agenda packets are copies of the draft work plan staff has been working on to carry out the update to the housing policy. She said that it summarizes the steps that staff plans to take specifically for community engagement, which includes creation of a stakeholder advisory committee which would ideally include one Planning Commission member, one Board of Supervisors member, and representatives of various groups throughout the community such as a low-income renter and a low-income homeowner (either one of which would ideally represent the senior community).

Ms. Pethia said that there will be four community meetings that are open to the public, three of which will be held at the front end of the process. She said that the first meeting would deal with learning, during which county staff and planning district Commission staff would bring housing information to the community, who would provide feedback and have their questions answered. Ms. Pethia said that the second meeting is about listening, during which staff will listen to feedback from community members and will focus around four broad categories of questions in a small group discussions. She said that the third meeting will focus on solutions as far as to what community members feel the county can do to help provide affordable housing and meet other housing needs in the county.

Ms. Pethia said that the fourth meeting is at the end of the process and is the public comment session. She said that in order to reach low-income community members who typically do not attend community meetings, staff will be working with local non-profits by interviewing their staff and creating focus groups of the clients they work with. Ms. Pethia said that through discussions with other county staff and some non-profits, they felt this was the best way to make lower-income community members feel comfortable and more open to discussing their needs, aspirations, and issues they currently face.

Ms. Pethia said that the other major component of the community outreach will be through a webpage that will be created for the county website, explaining that all information that is shared in the community meetings will be placed on the website. She said that the website would also have places for community members to provide comments after reading through the information. Ms. Pethia said that community members will be provided with the same PowerPoint slides and discussion topics that will be presented at the meetings and will be able to submit comments and feedback through the website.

Ms. Pethia said that at the end of the process, once all feedback from the community has been collected, the advisory committee will help formulate the policy recommendations and ensure county staff is being responsive to the community. She said that through all of this, the Planning District Commission is getting ready to start working on region-wide recommendations for affordable housing policies and strategies, and that she would be coordinating with them as much as possible to incorporate their work.

Mr. Keller asked if there were questions.

Mr. Dotson thanked everyone for shifting the agenda items and that the right decision was made. He apologized in advance and said that as a person who has designed and executed many study groups on various topics, he had a number of suggestions to make, which he hoped would be useful.

Mr. Dotson said that regarding the stakeholder advisory committee, he knows that it is good to keep a group to a number that isn't too large. He noted, however, that he knows of stakeholders that would be very beneficial to have in the group.

Mr. Dotson said that he would read an excerpt from the regional housing study: "The regional economy is largely split between high-wage professions running it, requiring at least a college degree, and lower-wage service jobs in restaurants, retail, hospitality, and other sectors. Many service businesses offer only part-time employment without benefits, often on an irregular schedule. Even two or three such jobs are not enough to afford most local housing. Accessing jobs requires car ownership or lengthy commutes on public transit, where available." Mr. Dotson suggested that someone from CAT or JAUNT be involved in this effort, because it is difficult (and a mistake) to separate housing from transportation.

Mr. Dotson said that he believes there should be someone included in the group who is a service-sector employer who deals with these issues on a regular basis. He said that reading on further in the regional housing study, it says, "Employers report difficulties in recruiting and retaining workers. Turnover and absenteeism are higher than desirable in part because of the burden of the long commutes. Those who must recruit workers with specialized skills often find they are forced to pay higher wages."

Mr. Dotson suggested that someone from PVCC, the local community college – either from the dean's office of workforce programs, or the dean of community self-sufficiency programs through which they are trying skills and jobs with housing. He said that this would add three more members, and he does notice that there is a technical committee and that Social Services appears on both committees. Mr. Dotson suggested that perhaps Social Services is only on the technical committee and dropped from the stakeholder committee, which would leave open one chair.

Mr. Dotson said that he had general comments about membership. He expressed his belief that committees work best when people have a "dog in the fight" – when each of them could potentially share a larger share of the responsibility than they have in the past. Mr. Dotson said that in this case, they would come to meetings so that they are able to weigh in on decisions made. He asked that when looking at these different sectors to think about who would have a stake and a share of responsibility, and a commitment to participate.

Mr. Dotson said that he has been on enough county committees where people left after the first meeting or two and didn't come back. He suggested that instead of merely asking a group to send a representative, the individuals should be hand-picked to ensure there are people selected who are known to have a of commitment and be supportive of making a difference. Mr. Dotson said that this meant that those selected wouldn't just come to the meetings to listen and be defensive of their interests, but they would come to talk and bring forth their ideas.

Mr. Dotson also said that while there are so many focus groups, he is concerned about the level of effort and wondered if some of the groups could be combined.

Ms. Pethia said that she has done many focus groups in the past and that she has help for these.

Mr. Dotson said that there is a section about the housing policy update and the things to be studied. He said that he would like to see this include best practices from elsewhere outside

Virginia. Mr. Dotson said that in creating the housing strategy, he would like to see two sections: one within the existing framework of Virginia, and a second set of recommendations about expanding the framework (which may be a longer-term strategy).

Mr. Dotson said that he when talking about affordable housing, there is much focus on housing, developers, and builders. He said that affordable housing, however, relates to income and jobs and that he believes a more balanced job should be approached as far as thinking about employers' roles in affordable housing. Mr. Dotson asked if the county, UVA, and the private sector shouldn't all be involved in this, noting that it's the relationship between income and housing that is the problem, not just the housing problem. He said that his idea was that employers could contribute to an affordable housing fund in an amount of each employee that they pay below a benchmark (for example \$15). Mr. Dotson said that in one sense, the income is creating the problem and it would have the employers provide both short-term affordable housing and, long term, incentive finding ways to pay their employees more in terms of waging. He summarized that the county should not only focus on the housing piece but should look at the whole package.

Ms. More said that the roles the Department of Social Services has to play in the Technical Advisory Committee (particularly because of the Housing Choice Voucher Program) and also as a stakeholder are both key. She said that she would keep them on both committees, with the understanding that Mr. Dotson said that there could only be so many people on each committee. Ms. More said that she didn't have the numbers handy for the Housing Choice Voucher Program, but that she sits on the DSS Advisory Board and the numbers are horrifying. She said that the waiting list for the program is long, and the situation is depressing. Ms. More reiterated that DSS is a key player in the technical piece as far as gathering data.

Ms. More said that regarding assisted living, there is an auxiliary grant for low-income people who need assisted living to have matching funds. She explained that the facility pays a lesser rate, and then the person's Social Security pays for part of it, as well as the state. Ms. More said that the facilities have to be willing to accept those vouchers, and the one that accepted the most has changed ownership and will no longer accept any, though they will allow those that live there to say. She said that she doesn't know the exact numbers, but it leaves the county with very few facilities that accept any vouchers and of those that do, it might be one or two beds. Ms. More said that this is a crisis and because of this, DSS has a role to play and it is a very important piece to talk about in terms of affordable housing for the aging population – not just aging in place but aging into a situation in which someone needs more assistance.

Mr. Bivins said that he would ask Ms. Pethia to consider a couple things for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. He said that while many people on it will have the means to change the stakes, but there is a group on the committee that is more of an advocacy group as opposed to a true stakeholder. Mr. Bivins suggested considering someone from the Community Foundation because some of the solutions will mean looking for people who would be willing to make grants and to make things happen. He said that the Community Foundation has access to people who have been thinking about housing, and that including them at the table would be helpful.

Mr. Bivins asked to also consider including someone from an Employee Relations Program. He said that when he was still working at the institution, there was the worst kind of performance from a host of people because of housing. Mr. Bivins said that either an employee's lease would change, they would experience a significant change in the household, or there would be a repair that would change the way they lived.

Mr. Bivins also suggested someone on the committee from SHE because he has worked with women in the community who have been displaced, and one of the problems with transitional housing is that there is no place for them to transition to. He said that this is a group of women with children who need places to live and helping them get there would smooth and eliminate some of the issues that come with having to be in temporary housing. Mr. Bivins said that these are people who could speak to how the system needs to change so that the county can be helpful.

Mr. Bivins said that regarding the aging population, a representative from JABA may want to be included as this is their expertise. He said that it would be brilliant if the people who could have influence on their strategies and mission statements could be on the committee and be held accountable by the outcomes.

Mr. Bivins said that he believes there is recession in the future. He said that the community would benefit from having this policy update done sooner rather than later, and to also consider the budget cycle. Mr. Bivins said that proceeding in the planned timeframe would cause them to miss two budget cycles, and he believes that what is being done is important enough to put in front of the Supervisors sooner than later. He said that the draft can be revised at another point in time, but to get something in front of the Supervisors that they can put into their budget cycle and put the Supervisors into a position in which they will have to respond.

Ms. Firehock said that she and Ms. Riley have tried to talk with the board about affordable housing, and Ms. Spain has worked on it as well. She said that they have tried hard to push the board to have policies and do things, and brought examples from other communities, and that it has been frustrating. Ms. Firehock said that she would like the board to take some action and that the focus on affordable housing shouldn't be only on Southwood.

Mr. Keller said that he believes that real data is needed. He said that there is real data available in real estate office with assessments that will show how many houses are assessed at an affordable rate in every magisterial district, which will be important to each of the supervisors. Mr. Keller said that he knows that Ms. Pethia is a data person and believes that some quick data collection that could really hit home in regards to the figures provided and that looks at the annual sales (over 1 year, 5 years, 10 years) to show how many of the existing affordable houses are being lost either due to flipping and selling at a higher rate, or due to homeowners improving the homes and moving them out of the affordable range.

Mr. Keller said that he knows this is happening all over the country and that there have been much lower existing home sales. Mr. Keller said that these are figures that he believes would be helpful and would separate the county from the city. He acknowledged that there would be more data on the region but said that he believes what the supervisors actually need data relevant to them and to their districts (whether they are shy of the averages, or above it). He added that looking at manufactured and modular housing is important to him and that further along the way, alternatives to stick-built homes should be considered, in addition to land banks (because of how they can work with the EPA) and land trusts (regarding what is happening on Nassau Street).

Ms. Riley said that she agrees with Mr. Bivins that this effort should try to be accelerated as much as possible, and that additional information to consider is not just the increases in sales prices and affordable property losses, but what outside and regional investors are coming in and purchasing up affordable properties. She said that to what extent this is driving up the cost should

be analyzed, and quantitative data should be provided as to how many of the homes are in investment firm holdings.

Ms. Firehock said that she has done a map by where homeowners live and if they actually live in the homes they own.

Mr. Keller said that there seems to be two sets of these scenarios that are being discussed. He said that the one set is the group that has real estate in the investment portfolio, who tends to be apartment complexes. Mr. Keller said that the other is the national Realtors (Red Fin) who are buying houses when there is someone who has the cash to want to buy it. He asked if either of those things are happening in the Charlottesville-Albemarle market.

Ms. Firehock asked if they were, what could the Commission do about it.

Mr. Keller said that they could be aware that this is beginning to affect the real estate prices.

Ms. Riley said that it would articulate a need for land banking for property acquisition and holding, and to target it in specific areas where gentrification occurs.

Ms. Spain said that she had three ideas. She said that first, as Mr. Keller said that, the Commission does not have any indication of supply. Ms. Spain said that they have the demand, but it seems impossible to find the supply. She said that she agrees with looking at the tax assessments, or Zillow. Ms. Spain also expressed the need to identify affordable housing, asking if the definition would be 80% of AMI and if it can be placed somewhere in the policy.

Ms. Spain said that another idea was that in the group of the underrepresented communities, there should be a representative from the disabled community because she assumes this will be the group that has the hardest time finding housing.

Ms. Spain said that her other thought is that she questions holding the meetings. She said that if TJPVC is doing the study, and with all the ideas that were just presented, is the committee's time going to be better spent collecting the data than doing a year's worth of meetings. Ms. Spain recognized that community engagement is important and clarified that she is not trying to eliminate it completely, but in terms of the best way to use limited resources, it seems as though they could piggyback with other agencies, and the result will be finding that more affordable housing is needed. She said that the groups could suggest housing programs to meet the needs of particular people (seniors, disabled, etc.).

Ms. Spain said that she shared Ms. Firehock's and Ms. Riley's frustration with studying and nothing happening. She said that it seems like more data collection and fewer meetings might spark more attention being paid to this.

Mr. Keller said that what Ms. Spain said that could be done – that most likely, a draft policy and action plan could be written first, and then go back and test it.

Ms. Pethia said that this would not necessarily be the appropriate way to write it. She said that there is already housing policy in her head, and that theoretically, she could draft it out in the next month and have the entire policy ready to go. Ms. Pethia said that she doesn't believe that this is the right thing to do, and that it would be using her assumptions based on data. She said that

there needs to be feedback from the community to understand their experiences more. Ms. Pethia said that she is a data person, but that she spent 4.5 years of her life doing qualitative research as she felt that housing policy was missing the human factor. She said that data has been used in the past to make policies that didn't work, so they did more surveys and data research and wrote new programs.

Ms. Pethia said that what they missed was actually talking to the people. She said that it needs to be a balance of both community and data, and that's why the community engagement piece is planned. Ms. Pethia said that the community engagement would go through the end of November or beginning of December, then the policy itself would be drafted and work would be done with the Technical Advisory and Stakeholder Committees to make sure the policy is ready.

Ms. Spain asked Ms. Pethia if, given her experience in qualitative work, she could provide an example of what a person will say.

Ms. Pethia said that first, they would speak to if they are a renter. She said that they would speak about negative things the landlord has done, and that it would be self-focused, which is what she needs to hear. Ms. Pethia said that it's important to hear the person's anger and frustrations to get to the real issue. She said that they could then discuss their experiences with housing, and it will most likely be issues about rent increases without an increase in salary. Ms. Pethia said that these issues hurt someone living on a fixed income (most likely a senior citizen) and that most likely, they have to move. She said that then, they cannot find something within their price range if all the rental properties in the county (particularly in the urban areas) are increasing 11-15% every year, so the person has to move farther away. Ms. Pethia said that then, the farther out they get, the less accessibility they have as they may be a senior who cannot drive.

Ms. Spain let Ms. Pethia know that she is not attacking her but said that the Commission knows these things. She said that the bottom line is how the county will create more affordable housing. Ms. Spain asked if the goal of this effort was to create and identify more affordable housing, or if it was to catalogue the problems that we know exist.

Ms. Pethia said that it was some of both. She said that her concern is that if they simply wrote a policy without the community engagement and buy-in, they run the risk of presenting recommendations for strategies and policies that are not going to be accepted by the community at large, causing the process to shut down. Ms. Pethia said that there is the potential that the new policies or strategies will not be implemented.

Mr. Keller noted that Ms. Pethia hadn't been formally introduced to the Commission, and that this should be done whenever there is a new county staff member. He asked Ms. Pethia if she could offer about 5-10 minutes on her bio as well as information on the ADU meeting she had organized. Mr. Keller said that this information would give a sense of what Ms. Pethia is already involved in as far as creating more ADUs.

Ms. Pethia said that she came to the area from Pittsburgh, where she had worked for the housing authority with the housing voucher program as the landlord outreach coordinator. She said that she has close to 20 years of experience in affordable housing policy and programs and has done everything from helping to draft regional policy for the Washington D.C. metro area to providing free home repairs with Rebuilding Together. Ms. Pethia said that she has a Ph.D. in Urban Regeneration Policy, with a specific focus on mixed income redevelopment and the social effects

it has on low-income residents.

Ms. Pethia said that there is a group she is working with in the city and that they are involved in a cohort technical assistance support program with Portland University, looking at ADUs and how they can be used for affordable housing throughout the county. She said that she has been in the area since December 2018.

Ms. Pethia said that there are a number of programs that they could implement now that would get housing started. She said that her concern is that without an official policy stating the county's goals, the strategies on how to address them, and the targets for affordable housing (for example, how many units to build each year to serve 80% or 50% AMI or below), the county will not have the tools in place to make sure that those units are done.

Ms. Firehock said that something the Commission has discussed in the past is that the county used to have a staffer whose job was to market affordable units. She said that this position no longer exists, and that units are marketed for a certain amount of time before going on the market. Ms. Firehock said that she doesn't know how big the problem is and the Commission has asked for this to be catalogued. She said that while folks will congratulate themselves for getting affordable housing, perhaps they really didn't get any of it, and that this is unknown. Ms. Firehock said that she would like to have this problem captured and catalogued so they can explain to the board why this position needs to be refilled, adding that there are things that they think they are doing that they are not actually doing.

Mr. Keller said that the other thing that has been discussed consistently is that of all of the affordable units that are proffered, how many of those have actually been built as the developers cut back on the number of units being built, and if the units are still affordable or if there has been a resell that took them out of the affordable market. He said that he believes Ms. Pethia should meet with Mark Graham before he leaves, as Mr. Graham has a good feel for it and how to get it. Mr. Keller said that this is institutional memory that is worth utilizing over the coming days or weeks.

Mr. Carrazana asked if Ms. Pethia includes workforce housing in the definition of affordable housing, and if it can be seen as part of this process or as a separate process.

Ms. Pethia said that she believes workforce housing should be part of the process. She said that the county needs to define what it means by workforce housing, as it varies across the country. Ms. Pethia explained that some cities look at this as 60-80% AMI income category, others take it up to 100%, and still others go to 80-120% AMI. She said that the county needs to define what it means by workforce housing and then figure out how to work it, as it is an important component of affordable housing.

Mr. Carrazana said that there is momentum with other partners in the community who are looking at affordable housing and are specifically looking at workforce housing. He said that the University and city are doing this, and the University Foundation is looking at this. Mr. Carrazana said that he thinks there are partners the county should reach out to, and that there has been a discussion before about workforce housing versus affordable housing and if they are the same or different. He said that to Ms. Pethia's point, there needs to be definitions.

Mr. Carrazana said that there are people who are actively looking at ways to bring in affordable

housing to the city, but to the county potentially as well. He said that UVA owns properties in both areas, and the question of land banking and opportunities for development is where partners can be found within the community. Mr. Carrazana said that how workforce housing is defined, and active engagement of the people currently looking at this, is an important issue. He said that he sensed the frustration with his colleagues that this is not moving along in the county as fast as is seen in other places. Mr. Carrazana said that he is unsure of why this is. He acknowledged that the county has affordable housing that looks very differently but said that he was unsure that this is the type of housing they need to develop, as it has limitations and challenges in terms of its infrastructure.

Mr. Carrazana said that there are opportunities to create affordable housing that is close to transit, which is currently a problem in the county. He encouraged the Planning Commission and staffers to engage supervisors to see if traction could be made in the county that he sees happening in other parts of the area. Mr. Carrazana said that partners in the community should be engaged who would actively fund this.

Ms. Pethia said that she agrees.

Ms. Spain said that this should not just mean building new units for rehabbing. She said that they spoke to AHIP some time ago about this.

Ms. Pethia said that preservation is a vital component that would definitely be included.

Ms. Spain asked if AHIP would be part of the focus group.

Ms. Pethia said that yes.

Mr. Dotson asked about next steps with the thought that the Commission moves forward with the resolution of intent but would ask Ms. Pethia to come back when she is ready (perhaps in a week or a month) to filter through the thoughts she heard at the meeting and present a second draft of her proposal.

Ms. Pethia said that the draft is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Supervisors for their comments next month (August). She asked if she could come back to the Commission after this to incorporate everyone's comments.

Mr. Dotson said that either before or after the board meeting is fine, but he was also mindful that several of the commissioners have commented about moving things forward quickly.

Mr. Keller asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak about the proposal. Hearing none, he said that action needed to be taken from the Commission.

Mr. Dotson moved that, for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, good land use planning practices, the Albemarle County Planning Commission hereby adopts a resolution to consider amending the 2015 Comp Plan to incorporate an updated affordable housing policy.

Ms. More seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller asked if there was any further discussion and heard none.

The motion carried by a vote of 7:0.

### **Review of the Board of Supervisors Meetings**

Mr. Benish said that on July 3, the Comp Plan amendment the biodiversity strategy was adopted by the board, as well as CPA201900001 Jefferson Area Bike and Pedestrian Plan as recommended and reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Benish said that ZMA201800019 (3226 Proffit Road), the development south of Proffit Road near Leek Lane, was also approved as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Benish said that the Willow Glen proffer amendment (Willow Glen being by the airport near Dickerson Road) was acted on as recommended by the Planning Commission and staff, which was denial of the amendment to the cash proffer amounts. He said that however, that there was approval of the credit for by-right development. Mr. Benish said that this was as the Planning Commission had acted and as what staff recommended.

Mr. Benish said that the Belvedere Carriage House Unit proffer amendment (ZMA20190723) was approved as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Benish said that on July 17, the Blue Ridge Swim Club (the two SPs for the additional dwelling unit on the site) was approved as recommended by the Planning Commission. He said that there were some changes to landscaping and discussion about the types of trees, and the applicant didn't make the change. Mr. Benish pointed out that the tree plantings were recommended by the consultant, not staff. He said that there was question in the presentation about who made the recommendation.

Mr. Benish said that ZMA201800013 Rio Road West (the storage yard and commercial-residential development on Rio Road near the library) was deferred by the applicant at the board meeting to address the issues the board had related to the timing and phasing of development of the front block. He said that the applicant agreed to daylight stream in the back by the open space area and are proposing to amend the proffers to do as such. Mr. Benish said that the primary issue was the timing and phasing of the development, and that the applicant is considering options for addressing this.

Mr. Benish said that the Birdwood Mansion and Grounds (ZMA201800014); Woolen Mills Light Industrial Park Steep Slopes (ZMA); Zero Lot Line ZTA; and Longhorn Steakhouse Special Exception in Fashion Square Mall to provide for pedestrian improvements and multi-use path were all approved as recommended by the Planning Commission.

### **Old Business**

There was no old business to report.

### **New Business**

Mr. Bivins asked if there was a sense of where they were with a successor to Mark Graham.

Mr. Herrick said that there were a number of interviews but beyond that, he was unsure of where they are in the process.

Mr. Benish said that they completed the interview process but nothing specific had been heard. He said that they would not be moving forward with any advertising until the position is filled, and the best guess of where this would be without knowing the final status is a new director of CDD is likely around the September timeframe. He said that once that person is in place, there would be advertisement for the position after that (October-December process). He said that he would keep the Commission posted on that process as well.

### **Adjournment**

At 10:33 p.m., the Commission adjourned to July 30, 2019 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

---

David Benish, Interim Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards. Transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 08/20/2019
Initials: CSS